

68
MAR 22 1923

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

EXTRA NUMBER

FEBRUARY, 1923

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION 1920-1921

Published Quarterly by
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Entered as second-class matter May 22, 1914, at the post office at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, under the Act of August 24, 1912

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
FOR THE YEAR
1920-1921**

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME X, PART III
FOR
THE YEAR 1920-1921



THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA
1923

COPYRIGHT 1923 BY
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

PREFACE

The board of editors of the *Mississippi valley historical review* herewith present the PROCEEDINGS of the association for the year 1920-21. This issue forms the third part of volume x, and the last, with the exception of the title page, table of contents, and index. These will be published shortly as a supplement to a number of the *Review*.

After this number the character of the PROCEEDINGS will be radically changed. No attempt will be made to print all or even the majority of the papers read at the two meetings. The place of these will be taken by articles on historical activities in the Mississippi valley, such as were formerly printed in the *Review*. Many students have regretted the omission during the last few years of these reviews of what was being done for the preservation of the knowledge of the past and have requested the editors to reinstate them. After a very careful consideration of the subject the editors have reached the foregoing decision.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Board of Editors

THOMAS M. MARSHALL	ARTHUR C. COLE
CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER	LESTER B. SHIPPEE
ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER	WALTER L. FLEMING
CLARENCE E. CARTER	JAMES A. JAMES

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

Guarantors

CHARLES G. DAWES	JULIUS ROSENWALD
FRANK O. LOWDEN	OTTO L. SCHMIDT
CYRUS H. McCORMICK	ANNA SILVER
HENRY J. PATTEN	UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN

CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

PREFACE	397
CONSTITUTION	401
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR 1920-1921	403
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR 1921-1922	405
MINUTES OF BUSINESS TRANSACTED	407
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER, APRIL 14, 1921.	413
STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY Clarence H. McClure	424
POPULARIZING STATE HISTORY Floyd C. Shoemaker	433
THE MOHEGAN INDIANS EAST AND WEST George A. Wood	440
THE CHARACTER AND LEADERSHIP OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS	
William O. Lynch	454
OHIO'S GERMAN LANGUAGE PRESS IN THE CAMPAIGN OF 1920	
Carl Wittke	468
THE ATTEMPT OF NEW ORLEANS TO MEET THE CRISIS IN HER TRADE WITH THE WEST Erastus Paul Puckett	481
PRESENT-DAY TENDENCIES IN THE TEACHING OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THE HIGH SCHOOL Roscoe Lewis Ashley	496
HISTORY IN THE STATE NORMAL SCHOOLS Walter B. Davison	506
THE AMERICAN BACKGROUND OF FEDERALISM (BY TITLE)	
Homer C. Hockett	522
THE POLITICAL CAREER OF IGNATIUS DONNELLY (BY TITLE)	
John D. Hicks	522
THE CONTROL OF MANUFACTURING BY THE CONFEDERATE GOVERN- MENT (BY TITLE) Charles W. Ramsdell	522
JOHN WESLEY, TORY (BY TITLE) William W. Sweet	522
THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THEIR WORK IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY (BY TITLE)	
Jenn Winslow Coltrane	522
ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE NORTH MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATES IN RELA- TION TO THEIR HISTORY (BY TITLE) George R. Fox	522
THE HISTORICAL MUSEUM—ITS MAKING AND ITS TEACHING VALUE (BY TITLE) Edward C. Page	522
<i>In re</i> THAT AGGRESSIVE SLAVOCRACY (BY TITLE)	
Chauncey S. Boucher	522

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK'S SERVICE OF SUPPLY (BY TITLE)		
	James G. Randall	522
THE STATE OF DESERET (BY TITLE)	Oscar A. Kinchin	522
SOME FACTORS IN THE EXPANSION OF METHODISM IN THE EARLY WEST (BY TITLE)	M. M. Gewehr	523
THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PENSION QUESTION, 1885- 1897 (BY TITLE)	Donald L. McMurry	523
ADVERTISING PROPAGANDA IN EARLY IOWA (BY TITLE)	Olynthus B. Clark	523
THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THE INDIANS IN TEXAS (BY TITLE)	Charles W. Ramsdell	523
THE RANCHMAN'S LAST FRONTIER (BY TITLE)	E. E. Dale	523
FIFTY-FIVE YEARS IN KANSAS (BY TITLE)	J. F. Botkin	523
ON THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS TO STATEHOOD (BY TITLE)	Ralph R. Price	523
PRESENT-DAY TENDENCIES IN THE TEACHING OF SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (BY TITLE)	J. R. H. Moore	523

CONSTITUTION¹

I — NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Mississippi valley historical association.

II — OBJECT

The object of the association shall be to promote historical study and research and to secure coöperation between the historical societies and the departments of history of the Mississippi valley.

III — MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this association shall be divided into three classes, namely: active, sustaining, and life members. Anyone interested in the study of Mississippi valley history may become a member in any of these classes upon payment of dues hereinafter provided.

IV — OFFICERS

The officers of the association shall be a president, and a secretary-treasurer, who with nine other active members, and such ex-presidents of the association as retain their membership therein, shall constitute the executive committee. Providing that all ex-presidents who have served on the executive committee for six consecutive years shall from and after that time no longer be ex-officio members of the executive committee.

The president, secretary-treasurer, and three members of the executive committee shall be elected at the annual meeting each year. The president and the secretary-treasurer shall hold office for one year, the members of the executive committee for three years or until their successors are elected and have qualified.

The executive committee shall have general charge of the affairs of the association, including the calling of meetings and selection of papers to be read. Five members of the executive

¹ As amended at the thirteenth annual meeting, April, 1920.

committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

At the first meeting of the executive committee after the annual election, one of its members shall be selected as chairman of the executive committee. It shall be his duty to preside at meetings of the committee and, in the absence of the president, at meetings of the association, and he shall succeed to the office of president in case of a vacancy.

V — MEETINGS

A regular annual meeting and a mid-year meeting of the association shall be held on such dates and at such places as the executive committee may determine.

VI — DUES

The annual dues for individual active members shall be three dollars. The annual dues for library members shall be four dollars. Sustaining members — either individuals or institutions — shall pay five dollars annually. Any individual may become a life member upon the payment of one hundred dollars.

VII — AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any regular meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at a previous meeting, or the proposed amendments having received the approval of the executive committee.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR THE YEAR 1920-1921

CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER, *President*
MRS. CLARENCE S. PAINE, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Lincoln, Nebraska

Executive Committee

In addition to the officers named above

Ex-Presidents

MILO M. QUAIFE (1926), *Chairman*
ISAAC J. COX (1921) FREDERIC L. PAXSON (1923)
DUNBAR ROWLAND (1922) ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT (1924)
HARLOW LINDLEY (1925)

Elected

WILLIAM E. CONNELLEY (1921) CHARLES W. RAMSDELL (1922)
THOMAS M. MARSHALL (1921) ROYAL B. WAY (1922)
LOUIS PELZER (1921) GUY STANTON FORD (1923)
SOLON J. BUCK (1922) MARGARET J. MITCHELL (1923)
WILLIAM W. SWEET (1923)

Executive Committee of the Teachers' Section

J. R. H. MOORE (1923), *Chairman*
HOWARD C. HILL (1921), *Secretary*
University of Chicago High School
WALDO F. MITCHELL (1921) EUGENE M. VIOLETTE (1922)
FRANCES MOREHOUSE (1922) BESSIE PIERCE (1923)

Finance Committee

MILO M. QUAIFE, *Chairman*
CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER CLARENCE W. ALVORD
MRS. CLARENCE S. PAINE

Appointive Committees

Membership Committee — J. H. A. Lacher, Waukesha, Wisconsin, chairman; Archibald Henderson, D. T. Herndon, Mrs. C. S. Paine, O. A. Rothert, O. L. Schmidt.

- Committee on Standardizing Library Work and Library Equipment for History in Secondary Schools* — Howard C. Hill, Chicago, chairman; T. C. Blegen, W. L. Fleming, A. H. Hirsch, Alma Hurst, Gertrude Ligon, F. E. Melvin, Margaret J. Mitchell, Alma Penrose, Bessie L. Pierce, A. H. Sanford, Elizabeth Thorndyke, R. M. Tryon, O. H. Williams.
- Committee on Historical Museums in Educational Institutions* — Edward C. Page, DeKalb, Illinois, chairman; A. H. Hirsch, J. M. McConnell, C. E. Pray, Lucy Simmons, J. A. Woodburn.
- Committee on Public Historical Museums* — Melvin R. Gilmore, Bismarck, North Dakota, chairman; H. A. Kellar, James Mooney, H. J. Webster, H. M. Whelpley.
- Committee on the Administration of State Historical Activities* — Solon J. Buck, St. Paul, chairman; W. E. Connelley, G. N. Fuller, J. W. Oliver, J. C. Parish, F. C. Shoemaker.
- Committee on the Teaching of State History in the High School* — Eugene M. Violette, St. Louis, Missouri, chairman; C. W. Alvord, J. E. Bradford, W. O. Lynch, L. B. Shippee, D. C. Shilling.
- Committee on Nominations* — Isaac J. Cox, Evanston, Illinois, chairman; M. M. Quaife, M. J. White.
- Program Committee* — Homer C. Hockett, Columbus, Ohio, chairman; G. N. Fuller, T. J. Jack, Margaret J. Mitchell, F. F. Stephens.
- Committee on Local arrangements for the Fourteenth Annual Meeting* — Martha Edwards, Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Anne T. Birge, O. D. Brandenburg, C. E. Brown, C. R. Fish, Louise P. Kellogg, D. E. Mowry, Annie A. Nunns, F. L. Paxson, M. M. Quaife, Joseph Schafer, Mrs. E. Ray Stevens.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR THE YEAR 1921-1922

WILLIAM E. CONNELLEY, *President*
MRS. CLARENCE S. PAINE, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Lincoln, Nebraska

Executive Committee

In addition to the officers named above

Ex-Presidents

MILO M. QUAIFE (1926), *Chairman*
DUNBAR ROWLAND (1922) ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT (1924)
FREDERIC L. PAXON (1923) HARLOW LINDLEY (1925)
CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER (1927)

Elected

OLON J. BUCK (1922) MARGARET J. MITCHELL (1923)
CHARLES W. RAMSDELL (1922) WILLIAM W. SWEET (1923)
ROYAL B. WAY (1922) WILLIAM C. COCHRAN (1924)
GUY STANTON FORD (1923) GEORGE N. FULLER (1924)
FLOYD C. SHOEMAKER (1924)

Executive Committee of the Teachers' Section

J. R. H. MOORE (1923), *Chairman*
BESSIE L. PIERCE (1923), *Secretary*
Iowa University High School

FRANCES MOREHOUSE (1922) WILLIAM HATHAWAY (1924)
EUGENE M. VIOLETTE (1922) CARL E. PRAY (1922)

Finance Committee

MILO M. QUAIFE, *Chairman*

CLARENCE W. ALVORD WILLIAM E. CONNELLEY
CHAUNCEY S. BOUCHER MRS. CLARENCE S. PAINE

Appointive Committees

Membership Committee — Mrs. Clarence S. Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska,
chairman.

- Committee on Historical Museums in Educational Institutions* — Edward C. Page, DeKalb, Illinois, chairman; A. H. Hirsch, J. M. McConnell, C. E. Pray, Lucy Simmons, J. A. Woodburn.
- Committee on Public Historical Museums* — Edgar R. Harlan, Des Moines, Iowa, chairman; Eunice Anderson, Clifford Meyers.
- Committee on the Administration of State Historical Activities* — Solon J. Buck, St. Paul, chairman; W. E. Connelley, G. N. Fuller, J. W. Oliver, J. C. Parish, F. C. Shoemaker.
- Committee on Nominations* — Christopher B. Coleman, Meadville, Pennsylvania, chairman; C. W. Ramsdell, I. J. Cox.
- Program Committee* — George N. Fuller, Lansing, Michigan, chairman; E. C. Barker, Archibald Henderson, J. C. Parish, W. S. Robertson, G. M. Stephenson.
- Committee on Local Arrangements for the Fifteenth Annual Meeting* — Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa City, Iowa, chairman; Ruth A. Gallaher, E. R. Harlan, D. L. McMurry, B. E. Mahan, Ethyl E. Martin, J. C. Parish, Louis Pelzer, Bessie L. Pierce, A. M. Schlesinger.

MINUTES OF BUSINESS TRANSACTED AT THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The business session of the association was called to order by the president immediately after luncheon on Friday, April 15, 1921, at Madison, Wisconsin. The report of the secretary-treasurer was first in order. The committee appointed to verify the fact that the financial statement had been prepared by a certified public accountant according to the rules of the association, was not present to report. The chairman, John W. Oliver, had expressed his approval to the president, however; and this indirect statement being considered sufficient, the report of the secretary-treasurer was accepted and placed on file.

Mr. Alvord gave an extemporaneous report as chairman of the board of editors and stated that the office of the managing editor had been moved from Urbana to Minneapolis in September, 1920. Mr. Alvord announced that tentative arrangements had been made to publish a series of volumes to be known as the Collections of the Mississippi valley historical association and he hoped that the first volume might be completed this year. The publication of collections to contain original source material on the valley was one of the original purposes for which the association was organized.

The chairmen of the various standing committees were called upon to give reports upon the work of the past year and the action previously taken regarding the same by the executive committee was announced.¹

The nominating committee reported the following names for election:

For president, William E. Connelley.

For secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Clarence S. Paine.

For members of the executive committee for three years, Floyd C. Shoemaker, George N. Fuller, William C. Cochran.

¹ Summaries of these reports are printed *post*, pp. 416-421.

For members of the executive committee of the teachers' section for three years, Otis Games, chairman, William Hathaway.

For secretary of the teachers' section, Miss Bessie Pierce, to take the place of Howard C. Hill.

For members of the board of editors, Thomas M. Marshall, Chauncey S. Boucher, Arthur M. Schlesinger.

The report of the nominating committee was accepted and the secretary instructed to cast the ballot for the above named officers and members of committees.

Invitations were offered to the association to meet in 1922 at Iowa City, Oklahoma City, Pierre, South Dakota, and Chicago. The association expressed itself in favor of Iowa City for 1922 if approved by the executive committee, upon which the invitations from the other cities were renewed for a more distant date.

The resolutions committee by its chairman, Louis Pelzer, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Mississippi valley historical association be extended to the various committees which have so successfully carried on the work of the organization during the past year.

That we express our appreciation to the program committee for obtaining a program of suggestive and stimulating papers for this meeting.

That special thanks are due to Miss Martha L. Edwards, the chairman, and to the other members of the committee on local arrangements, for the pleasant and agreeable accommodations provided for the visiting members of the association.

That the grateful appreciation of this association be expressed to the department of history of the University of Wisconsin and to the State historical society of Wisconsin, to the University club, to President Birge and to Miss Birge, and to all others who have extended gracious hospitalities to the members of the Mississippi valley historical association.

Whereas, Recent reports from the national capital indicate that plans which had been proposed for the locating of a national archives building in the city of Washington miscarried in the regular session of the sixty-sixth congress; and

Whereas, The erection, at an early date, of an archives building for the preservation, care, and proper organization of the archives of the

American government is a matter of crucial importance to the country, not merely from the historical point of view but from the point of view of current political information as well; and

Whereas, The states represented in the Mississippi valley historical association have a special interest in the erection, equipment, and organization of an adequate archives building in the city of Washington, in view of their distance from the national capital and their continual need of access to papers and collections of documents pertaining to the activities of the government departments; and

Whereas, Some of these states are now, and have been for six or seven years, expending considerable sums of money annually in maintaining workers at the national capital for the purpose of making available certain small portions of the material contained in the departmental manuscripts, which material ought to be calendared under the direction of a national archivist and made available for the use of all states as well as individual investigators, at a minimum expense; and

Whereas, The people of these states, as well as the people of the United States generally, have a right and duty to insist that the archives of the national government, which are the sources of their history, shall be kept safe from possible destruction and loss, by being housed in an absolutely fireproof building; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Mississippi valley historical association, representing the historical students and workers in the states of Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, hereby earnestly request the honorable senate and the house of representatives of the United States to find if possible at the present special session of congress a solution for the problem of locating the archives building in the city of Washington, to the end that the building itself may be begun and completed with as little loss of time as possible.

Resolved, secondly, That the delegations from the several states of the Mississippi valley in which legislatures are now in session are requested to ask their several legislatures to memorialize the United States senate and house of representatives on the subject of the location of the archives building at Washington, and of the early construction and completion of that important public work.

Resolved, finally, That the members of this association are requested individually and collectively to write members of the senate and the

house of representatives of the United States, urging the importance of this work.

The business session was then adjourned.

The executive committee met on April 15 at 8:30 A. M., Milo M. Quaife, chairman, presiding. There were present: Isaac J. Cox, Chauncey S. Boucher, Frederic L. Paxson, Harlow Lindley, Thomas M. Marshall, Louis Pelzer, Charles W. Ramsdell, Solon J. Buck, Guy Stanton Ford, William W. Sweet, Margaret Mitchell, and Mrs. Clara S. Paine.

The secretary gave reports on the various standing committees as furnished by the chairmen. The committee on standardizing library work and library equipment in secondary schools was discharged upon the request of Mr. Hill, the investigation by the committee having been completed and the report published.

The recommendations offered by Mr. Moore, chairman of the executive committee of the teachers' section,¹ were considered; and though it was decided that the suggested investigation would be profitable, the following resolution was offered by Mr. Ford and unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the executive committee is interested in the program formulated and submitted by Mr. Moore and his committee. The report suggests a broad field of experimentation which can only be developed by coöperative effort and well controlled scientific study. Such a plan involves the contribution of all interested in history and the social sciences in elementary, secondary, and college work; and in addition school supervision and educational psychologists must be brought in. Such coöperative work carried on through a number of years would give results much more valuable than *a priori* opinions. A task so largely conceived ought to have the support of the corresponding committee of the American historical association. With its endorsement it might be possible to interest some of the foundations in giving financial assistance. The executive committee therefore directs the secretary of the Mississippi valley historical association to transmit a copy of the committee's recommendations and of this resolution to the secretary of the American historical association with the suggestion that it be put in the hands of the proper committee or official in that organization.

The report of Mr. Page, chairman of the committee on his-

¹ These recommendations are printed *post*, pp. 416-417.

torical museums in educational institutions, was considered and the committee continued under the same chairman.

The committee on the administration of state historical activities, Solon J. Buck, chairman, was also continued.

The committee on public historical museums was discharged, the work to be continued under a new committee.

Upon request of the chairman, E. M. Violette, the committee on the teaching of state history in the high school was discontinued.

The recommendations made by the chairman of the program committee were carefully considered and it was decided that the plan followed in preparing the last program was a very good one. It was not thought best to bind future program committees to follow the same procedure, however, and the matter was left for further discussion.

Thomas M. Marshall, a member of the program committee for the meeting of the American historical association to be held in St. Louis in December, offered some details regarding plans for that meeting. Joseph Schafer was appointed to represent the Mississippi valley historical association in arranging the program for the joint session in December.

Members of the executive committee expressed appreciation to the men and institutions contributing to the guaranty fund for printing the *Review* during the past year and instructed the secretary to continue and increase this fund in every way possible.

Isaac J. Cox, chairman of the nominating committee, offered the preliminary report of that committee, naming for president, William E. Connelley; for members of the executive committee, Floyd C. Shoemaker, George N. Fuller, William C. Cochran.

The executive committee then adjourned to meet after the business session.

The executive committee met at 2:30 p. m., April 15, Milo M. Quaife, chairman, presiding. There were present: Isaac J. Cox, Chauncey S. Boucher, Frederic L. Paxson, Harlow Lindley, Charles W. Ramsdell, Solon J. Buck, Guy S. Ford, William W. Sweet, Margaret Mitchell, Floyd Shoemaker, George N. Fuller, William E. Connelley, and Mrs. Clara S. Paine. Mr. Quaife was

elected chairman of the executive committee for the coming year.

The three nominees for the board of editors suggested by the nominating committee at the business session of the association were approved by the committee; and Mr. Boucher, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Schlesinger were duly elected for three years.

A resolution was offered and unanimously adopted that it be the policy of the association to appoint one member of the nominating committee and one member of the program committee to hold over each year.

It was voted to increase the personnel of the finance committee by adding as a member the outgoing president to serve for one year. The investment of the money accumulating from life membership dues was left to the judgment of the finance committee.

The meeting was then adjourned.

CLARA S. PAINE, *Secretary*

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

(MAY 1, 1920, TO APRIL 14, 1921)

The work of the association during the past year has been of absorbing interest. The wave of economic depression that has swept over the entire country has been keenly felt, and while the general expenses of the association have steadily increased it has been difficult to keep the regular income from membership dues and guaranty pledges from decreasing.

Experiences of the past year make it more than ever apparent that some plan should be devised and carried out to increase in a substantial way, and immediately, the permanent fund that has been begun from the receipts of life membership dues so that the interest thereof would be a guaranty of sufficient income to tide the association over any economic stringency that should arise. A permanent fund can be raised if sufficient thought and effort is put into the matter, provided that every member will help. Historical interest is widespread and there is hardly a city in the United States in which there is not someone who would be interested and willing as well as financially able to take out a life membership in this association.

The life membership dues are now \$100. It should be possible to get two hundred life members. With a permanent fund of \$20,000 the association will be in a position to promote its work and increase its membership unhampered by the continual fear of not being able to meet expenses. Fifteen life members were added from May 1, 1920, to December 31, 1920, as follows: Albert J. Beveridge, Indianapolis; Mrs. Luther A. Brewer, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; E. E. Bruce, Omaha; William C. Cochran, Cincinnati; Max Farrand, New Haven, Connecticut; Frank Hamlin, Chicago; George W. Holdredge, Omaha; Luther M. Kuhns, Omaha; Gilbert Lincoln Lacher, La Grange, Illinois; Walter Scott Lacher, La Grange, Illinois; William B. McKinley, Champaign, Illinois; Clifford Myers, Charleston, West Virginia; N. S. Thomas,

Cheyenne, Wyoming; Samuel P. Wilson, Lexington, Kentucky; E. W. Young, St. Paul.

It is with great regret that we record the death of the following members, all of whom had been identified with the association for many years: Walter B. Douglas, St. Louis; Charles S. Glead, Topeka, Kansas; Alonzo L. Kimber, Chicago; Publius V. Lawson, Menasha, Wisconsin; Richard Taylor Stevenson, Delaware, Ohio; and Homer J. Webster, Pittsburgh.

The association at this time has a membership of 776, with representatives in every state in the union except Delaware, 14 members in Canada, 2 in France, 2 in Great Britain, and 1 in the Philippine Islands. The membership consists of 39 life members, 52 sustaining members, and 685 individual and library members. There are represented in this membership 54 historical societies, 14 state libraries, 34 normal and high school libraries, 29 state university libraries, 66 other university and college libraries, and 77 public libraries. Illinois leads all the states with an even 100 members; Iowa is second with 57; Indiana next with 55; Wisconsin and Missouri have 46 each; Ohio, 42; Minnesota, 37; Nebraska, 34; New York, 33; Michigan, 29; Texas and Massachusetts, 24 each; Kentucky, 19; Louisiana, 18; Pennsylvania, 17; Kansas, 16; and so forth. This year 91 new members were added; 6 were lost by death; 45 canceled or were dropped for non-payment of dues, making a total gain of 40.

This is not enough. This association is no longer an experiment. There is a definite work to be done, and our position among the leading historical agencies of the world is now recognized. Publicity must be given to the work of the association and special stress must be laid upon the fact that membership is not limited to those engaged in educational work but is opened to the thousands of people of college and university training and to the thousands of men of broad culture who may not have had any academic training but who know life and have a real love for history and who desire to promote historical reading and study. If this association is to get the kind of members that will give it the financial power to do things, big things, and worth while things for scholarship, it must get to the people, and to do so it must be in some measure popular. From Mr.

Shoemaker's experience in Missouri we are assured that success is possible.

The association held its usual mid-year meeting in connection with the American historical association in Washington, December 28-30. The program was arranged by James A. James of Northwestern university. Fully 75 members of the Mississippi valley historical association were registered and the dinner held on the evening of December 28 was attended by more than 125. Frederick J. Turner of Harvard university gave an interesting address following the dinner. Mr. Boucher presided over the session Wednesday morning. Four papers were read: "The American background of federalism," by Homer C. Hockett of Ohio state university; "The political career of Ignatius Donnelly," by John D. Hicks of Hamline university; "John Wesley, Tory," by William W. Sweet of DePauw university; "Manufacturing interests of the confederate government," by C. W. Ramsdell of the University of Texas. The mid-year meeting this year will be in St. Louis and should be of particular interest to the members of this association.

Invitations have been received from the State historical society of Iowa and the state university to meet in Iowa City in 1922; from the business clubs of Sioux City and Morningside college, to meet in Sioux City; from the State historical society of Oklahoma, to meet in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, or Muskogee.

A questionnaire was sent to the members of the executive committee early in the year to determine the place of meeting for 1921; to present a request from Mr. Hill and other chairmen for some appropriation to carry on the work of the various standing committees; to consider a communication from Mr. Hockett regarding the policy of the program committee. A majority of the committee favored accepting the invitation to meet in Madison although it was a matter of regret that the very cordial invitation from Mr. Herndon of the Arkansas historical commission could not also be accepted. Mr. Hill's plea regarding the needs of his committee was so effective in showing that the final report of his work could not be made without some assistance that the majority of the executive committee was in favor of making an appropriation if the funds

of the association would permit. The finance committee allowed \$25 with which to complete the work of the committee on standardizing library work and library equipment in secondary schools. Mr. Hockett's suggestion was happily disposed of by making him chairman of the program committee.

The executive committee held an informal meeting in Washington on December 29 to determine the date of meeting at Madison. The local committee was represented by Miss Louise P. Kellogg. A tentative outline of the program was offered by Mr. Hockett. Feeling the need of bringing the attention of the general public to the work of this association, the committee discussed the advisability of obtaining newspaper publicity. This resulted later in an offer by Mr. George N. Fuller of the Michigan historical commission to supply material for the Associated press. Mr. Fuller has devoted considerable time and effort to this matter. The secretary would like to suggest that a publicity committee be created to continue this work.

The following is a brief outline of the work of the standing committees for the Mississippi valley historical association for the year 1920-1921.

Howard C. Hill, chairman of the committee on standardizing library work and library equipment in secondary schools, says, "Our committee completed its work, and in accordance with the resolution adopted at the last annual meeting of the association, submitted it for the approval of the executive committee of the teachers' section. This approval having been given, a portion of the report was published in the February issue of the *School review*. The report in full is ready for publication in the annual volume of PROCEEDINGS.

J. R. H. Moore, chairman of the executive committee of the teachers' section, states that this committee has been unfortunate in its membership in that one member has been ill a long time, another has been in Europe, and the address of one is not known. He desires a "live" committee for the coming year. Mr. Moore reports:

"1. The executive committee of the teachers' section recommends that Dr. Hill's committee . . . be continued and that all members of the association be ready to assist the committee in every possible way.

"2. The committee also recommends that a committee be appointed to carry on the work along the line of tests from the point of view of history instruction. So much work has been done in the line of intelli-

gence tests that it seems reasonable to suppose that there may be something of value for history teachers in this line of investigation.

"3. The committee also recommends that members of the association pay special attention to the plan of arranging divisions in history courses according to the results of rating by intelligence instead of by the mechanical devices commonly used.

"4. The committee recommends lastly that the teachers' section encourage some form of investigation along the line of revision of the curriculum of history in secondary schools. The committee suggests that work similar to that done by Professor Ashley will be of great value to history instruction everywhere."

Edward C. Page, chairman of the committee on historical museums in educational institutions, has held two committee meetings and has outlined preliminary investigations. He states that the work of the committee is important and wishes the committee continued until it can make a complete report.

Solon J. Buck, chairman of the committee on the administration of state historical activities, states that the members of this committee have been accumulating material and ideas on the subject and expect to confer together at Madison. Mr. Buck desires the committee continued.

Melvin R. Gilmore, chairman of the committee on public historical museums, says:

"I have not succeeded in gathering general data upon the work of state historical museums. However, I may offer the following notes upon the work of the State historical museum of North Dakota.

"The most noteworthy work of the present time in the activities of this museum is the fostering of historical parks in communities throughout the state. Several historic sites are already marked by reservation of parcels of ground as public historical parks. These sites comprise Indian village sites, early trading posts, military posts, missionary establishments, and the like.

"Also a memorial to the soldiers and sailors from North Dakota who served the nation in the German war is planned and its construction is under way in the form of a building in which is to be housed the state historical society museum and library. This building is to be known as the Liberty memorial building, and attached to it by the act of legislature providing for the building is also a tract of ground to be known as the Liberty memorial park. This park is a part of the state capitol grounds, but pertaining particularly to the Memorial building. The building is to be one of an architectural group of state buildings.

The entire capitol grounds comprise 160 acres; the memorial park occupies 10 acres of this ground. The plan for the historical park, or memorial park, is the keynote of the treatment of the entire grounds of the capitol; it is all to be a unified whole in its landscape treatment.

"In planning and planting of parks heretofore there has been no thought of individual expression of local native character of the regions where the several parks are situated. They are of a set fashion, largely exotic in their floral population. So it is that a park pertaining to any given city from Boston to Omaha will differ very little from any other. The visitor to one sees but a monotonous repetition of every other park he has seen, and in none of them will he find an exposition of the native flora of the immediate region of the given park.

"But the state of North Dakota has adopted the plan proposed by the curator of the state historical society for the development of its capitol grounds, which, when accomplished, will make the grounds a living outdoor museum of the state. This plan will give to North Dakota's capitol grounds a characteristic beauty and interest of their own and a unique distinction. Probably no other state, certainly none of the older states, now has the possibility which North Dakota has in this respect; for their capitol grounds are already closely impinged on by the surrounding buildings on private property. But by this exercise of foresight North Dakota has an opportunity which can be developed through long time to come, improving every year. Nothing which is done by this plan need be merely temporary; all that is done makes for ultimate and permanent improvement.

"The plan is to employ nothing but native trees, shrubs, vines, and flowering plants for the general planting system of this park. Several purposes will be served by this plan. In the first place native vegetation is already acclimated and will be more successful, for it has become adjusted to conditions through a period of thousands of years. Also the native species will possess more of an air of content, of dignity and stability as communities of residents by natural right, and not the dejected, homesick, and apologetic air of captive aliens in unfriendly surroundings. The native vegetation will be more harmonious and in keeping with its surroundings. By the use of native vegetation the planting will be more successful and healthy, and also will be actively stimulative to the historical sense in evoking in the minds of visitors pictures of the original appearance of North Dakota before the changes and ravages which have been wrought by agricultural operations, road building, and other industrial operations.

"This outdoor museum will afford the people opportunity to become acquainted with the natural beauties of the state; and with the acquaint-

ance is bound to come a deeper feeling of attachment and contentment. There is no property which is so valuable as this to citizens, and none so essential to the integrity and stability of a state.

"By the plan which is adopted the state capitol grounds are to be an expression of art and science, of beauty and knowledge; and in the mind's eye of the one who conceived the plan it is seen as a constantly growing and improving institution through all the years of the future. The park of the capitol grounds will constitute in itself by this plan an educational institution for all the people. Here may be learned much of the botany and zoölogy of this region, and also of ethnology, history, and archaeology, as well as an appreciation of the beauties of nature, of landscape, and of architecture.

"What is contemplated in the plan for the park of the capitol grounds on a comprehensive scale is also to be employed in such measure as circumstances allow in the other state historical parks in the various places where they are situated.

"It is the policy of our historical museum to make itself useful for instruction to the general public as much as possible, and also to public school classes and individuals and groups of pupils. To this end the exhibits are arranged with regard to logical order, and plainly and intelligibly labeled. Special exhibits of objects of immediately timely interest are made from time to time, attention being called to such displays through the public press and otherwise. Teachers are invited to make fullest use of the museum objects and the services of the curator for purposes of instruction."

E. M. Violette, chairman of the committee on the teaching of state history in the high school, states that his committee has been hampered by the lack of funds to carry on the investigation planned.

J. H. A. Lacher, chairman of the membership committee, says that he has personally obtained two life members and two annual members; that owing to the extensive territory covered by the association he believes that the only membership campaign that can be made with little expense is through the columns of the *Review*. To prove effective these appeals should be continued. The secretary is of the opinion that a number of the new members reported elsewhere were enrolled as a result of the work done by Mr. Lacher. If any member of the association can offer a plan for increasing the membership it certainly should be considered.

Homer C. Hockett, chairman of the program committee, says:

"The committee aimed primarily at two things: (1) to secure papers by members who had not heretofore, or at least recently, appeared upon

our programs; (2) to secure a somewhat equitable geographical distribution of the places on the program.

"The chairman of the committee had the impression, at the time of his appointment, that members of the committee in previous years had perhaps lacked definiteness of plan in these respects, and had thought too exclusively of the excellence of the program, with the result that they had called upon their friends and acquaintances so that some members had participated quite frequently in programs, while a great many had not participated at all. Whether this impression was correct or not, the chairman of the present committee believed that there should be a definite effort to avoid such dangers, and requested the members to govern themselves accordingly. On the whole, the program shows that the guiding principle has been followed, although there are two exceptions, due to exigencies that could not readily be dealt with.

"To further the second aim, the chairman requested the president of the association to appoint committee members from the four quarters of the Mississippi valley, making the Ohio river the dividing line east of the Mississippi, and the Missouri river and Kansas-Nebraska boundary the dividing line west of the Mississippi. The chairman acted for his quarter, and requested each of the other members to be responsible for his quota of papers in his quarter, taking advice from any friends in the profession or others who could further the purpose of the committee, at his discretion, and submitting results to the chairman, who acted as a sort of clearing house. In addition to the four members for the four quarters of the valley, a fifth was appointed to represent the interests of the historical societies, and he was requested to be responsible for the program of one session, without geographical limitations. The committee also worked in coöperation with the chairman of the teachers' section, who undertook to prepare the program of a session. The results of this plan show a wide distribution of program honors, notwithstanding the fact that one quarter of the valley is wholly unrepresented. The committeeman from this quarter, after accepting his appointment, failed to respond to the chairman's communications. This experience perhaps illustrates one weakness of the plan on which the committee proceeded.

"In giving invitations to participate in the program, members of the committee stressed two things: the importance of attendance in person for the reading of the paper, and the time limit of twenty minutes for the reading. After the program was made up, the chairman addressed a personal letter to each individual on the program, a copy of which follows. In the case of persons who were not members of the association, the starred paragraph was added:

"Dear Sir:

"As chairman of the program committee for the Madison meeting of the M. V. H. A., I wish to thank you for accepting a place on the program. Will you pardon me for reminding you that the committee is stressing two points, viz., that papers shall not consume more than twenty minutes each in reading, and that writers shall attend and present their papers in person? I should be glad if you would give yourself the trouble to send me a line signifying your purpose to attend the meeting. I hope that a copy of the printed program can be placed in your hands within the next two or three weeks. The dates of the meeting are April 14-16.

"With hearty appreciation for your coöperation in making the program a success, I am,

Sincerely yours,

"* "In looking over the list of members of the association I do not find your name. It would give me real pleasure if you would allow me to notify the secretary of your willingness to join with us."

"In conclusion the committee suggests that if the association feels that its procedure is desirable in the practice of future committees, two points might well be observed: (1) As a rule, persons should not be asked to appear on programs who have done so within, say, three years. Perhaps the time should be four or five years. (2) Some member of the present committee should be appointed chairman for next year, to insure the continuity of the policy."

The association expresses its appreciation to the local committee on arrangements in Madison for the printing of the programs.

This association was represented by several members, on leave of absence for research work abroad, at the English historical meeting in Cambridge on January 6 to 10. A report of this conference was furnished to the *Review* by Professor J. Howard Robinson of Northfield, Minnesota. This association has been invited to send representatives to the Anglo-American conference of professors of history to be held in London, July 21. At the present time Mr. Robinson, Mr. James E. Willard, member of the board of editors, and Miss Frances Morehouse of the executive committee of the teachers' section are in Great Britain.

Attached hereto is the financial statement for the year ending

April 5. The balance in the checking account is not large but all bills are paid to date. David R. Forgan, president of the City National Bank of Chicago, in a speech on March 6, declared, "The past three months have been filled with reports which show that the general economic condition is extremely grave. The present industrial condition is the most serious in the last forty-four years." In view of this fact the association should have the coöperation of every member to the end that the coming year may not prove a disastrous one. The thanks of the association are due to the men and institutions that have contributed to the guaranty fund during the past year.

The following is the financial report of the secretary-treasurer for the past year.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

APRIL 24, 1920—APRIL 5, 1921

Receipts

Individual membership fees	\$ 718.00	
Library membership fees	918.66	
Sustaining and life membership fees	955.00	
Guarantee for printing publications	1,050.00	
Advertising	127.50	
Book sales	507.40	
Exchange	3.65	
Dues of new members	276.00	
Interest on savings account	29.12	
		<hr/>
Total receipts		\$4,585.33
Balance on hand April 24, 1920		1,665.90
		<hr/>
Total balance carried forward		\$6,251.23

Disbursements

Publications	\$2,305.09
Clerical salaries	741.40
Editorial expense	621.69
Postage and express	140.29

Miscellaneous printing	162.70
Office supplies	48.50
Traveling expense	239.38
Freight and drayage	13.26
Commission on books and new members .	394.97
<hr/>	
Total disbursements	\$4,667.28
Balance on hand April 5, 1921	1,583.95
<hr/>	
	\$6,251.23

The balance on hand consists of a checking account in bank, \$371.26 (\$381.26, less check number 323, outstanding, \$10.00); and a savings account in bank, \$1,212.69.

This is to certify that we have audited the accounts of Clara Paine, Secretary of the Mississippi valley historical association, for the period from April 24, 1920, to April 5, 1921, and that the foregoing is a correct statement of the receipts and disbursements for the period.

The receipts have been verified by checking, item by item, the stubs of the cash receipts retained by the secretary; and the disbursements have been verified by an approved receipted voucher for each and every disbursement; the balance on hand has been verified by the balanced pass books of the National Bank of Commerce, of Lincoln, Nebraska.

WIGGINS-BABCOCK COMPANY, *Public Accountants*

BY ROBT. H. VAN BUSKIRK

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, April 8, 1921.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARA S. PAINE, *Secretary-Treasurer*

STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY

While it is possible to have state history of a certain type with little attention given to local history, such state history is likely to be inaccurate, and it is necessarily partial in its viewpoint. On the other hand it is possible to have local history that apparently has no connection whatever with state history, but such local history usually degenerates into mere antiquarianism, and is hardly worthy of the name history. Just as there is a vital relationship between the state and the local communities of which the state is composed, so there is a decidedly important relationship between state and local history. In this paper, however, state history will be discussed first and local history later. It is hoped that the relationship mentioned will become apparent as the discussion proceeds.

State history had its beginning soon after the states came into existence. The history of state history may be divided into two large periods separated by the civil war. During the first period the idea of the sovereignty of the state was strong in the minds of the people. This was reflected in much of the state history written before 1861. The civil war decided forever the question of state versus national sovereignty. After that, "nation" was spelled with a big *N* and the writers of state history were somewhat at a loss to know how to handle their subject. After the war some historians clearly showed their pre-war training in the way they defended the general idea of state sovereignty.

The *American commonwealth* series, written at various intervals through a period of about thirty years extending from the later seventies through the first decade of the present century, represents a conscious effort to get away from the earlier type of state history. According to the publishers, the purpose of the series is to present the state in its relation to the development of the nation. In announcing the series they say that it is a "series narrating the history of such states of the union

as have exerted a positive influence in the shaping of the national government or have a striking political, social or economical history. . . . The commonwealth has always been a positive force in American history; and it is believed that no better time could be found for a statement of the life inherent in the states than when the unity of the nation has been assured; and it is hoped by these means to throw new light upon the development of the country, and to give a fresh point of view for the study of American history." The authors of the various volumes of the series made no effort to write the history of the period following the civil war. In the case of Maryland the entire volume deals with the history of the state before the revolutionary war. In the history of Virginia, 472 of the 510 pages are devoted to the period before the adoption of the constitution of the United States. But most of the writers of the series close their histories with the civil war period.

Of the 512 works on state history listed in Hart and Channing's *Guide*, 149 were published before 1861, and 363 since that date. But so far as I have been able to examine volumes published since the civil war, practically all of them deal with the early history and close with the civil war period. Those that attempt to do more simply give a brief record of the political annals of the recent period.

If we narrow the field to textbooks, we find that the first history textbook published in this country, according to the list prepared by Professor W. T. Russell, was not a national but a sectional history. It was a history of New England written by Hannah Adams and published in Boston in 1799. The strong tendency toward nationalism following the second war with England, marked in the field of politics by the creation of the second United States bank and the passage of a protective tariff, produced the first textbooks in United States history.

The reaction against this drift toward nationalism in the later twenties, marked particularly by the attempt at nullification of the national law on the part of South Carolina, coincides with the publication of the first textbooks in state history. In 1828 two state histories, one of Vermont, the other of New York, were published by F. C. Eastman. Six years later there

appeared a history of New Hampshire by J. N. Whitson. In 1840 a history of South Carolina by G. W. Simms was published. This was followed in 1850 by a *Catechism of the history of South Carolina* by W. Rivers. Another history of New York, by E. Guernsey, appeared in 1852. These are all the textbooks in state history mentioned by Professor Russell in his list of textbooks which appeared before the civil war. Of the six textbooks published, two were histories of New York and two were histories of South Carolina.

In recent years many special students of history have doubted whether state history is worth while. Committees on state history have been appointed by historical associations, but they have not usually taken their problem seriously. If state history is to be limited to the type of political history that has usually been written, I am quite willing to agree with that attitude. But if history, even national history, is to continue to hold its place in our schools, it must not be limited chiefly to political development as it has been in the past.

History is on the defensive in our curriculum to-day. This fact was very noticeable before the war gave such an emphasis to the study of history, and it is no less true because it is not quite so apparent at the present time. The most dangerous rivals of history are not the vocational subjects like manual training, agriculture, and household arts, but the so-called social sciences such as economics, sociology, community civics, social civics, and the like. The workers in these various fields start out bravely to solve their problems, but soon find that they must study history to understand them. We soon have economic history and social history, and the various other types of history appearing in our college curriculum. Probably the distinguishing characteristic of this history is that it must be taught in some particular department other than the history department. Much duplication and confusion is brought about in this way. These courses tend to make their way downward from the college to the high school. This is a condition which has existed for a number of years. It is the problem which the N.E.A. committee on social science attempted to solve some years ago.

This problem probably arose in the first place because of the failure of writers and teachers of history to occupy their field. History alone presents the unifying thread which binds these various phases of development together. The elements of all of these social sciences are found in any community. The full history of any community is bound to deal with all of them. But no community can exist for any length of time in our country outside of a state. In fact the state gives to the community whatever legal right it has to exist. The state makes the rules for the economic, social, educational, and industrial organizations in the community. Each community within a state has certain characteristics in common with all other communities within the state. Therefore the state is the logical unit for the study of community development whether civic, industrial, social, or of any other type. The life of the community cannot be understood apart from its history. In view of these facts state history of this more complete type furnishes the key for the solution of the problem of the social studies in our schools. On the other hand, if state history is to survive and be worth while, it must be state history of this more complete type. It must be state history which deals with the organization and development of the community life of a state. It must deal with the economic history, the social history, the educational history, and the industrial history. This does not mean that the political and governmental history will be left out, but it does mean that this must be given its proper setting in relation to the various other lines of development.

The state in this country may be thought of as a sort of laboratory where social experiments have been and are being made. An experiment is tried in one state; if it is successful, it is adopted by other states; if it fails, only one state has suffered loss by the trial.

A successful experiment is usually adopted by more and more states until it becomes nation-wide. This may be accomplished through voluntary action on the part of the individual states, through federal law, or through amending the federal constitution. Thus Maine, Kansas, and Iowa experimented with prohibition. Several of the western states tested woman suffrage.

Oregon began the election of her United States senators by direct vote of the people, that vote being later formally ratified by the state legislature to satisfy the federal constitution. These experiments having proved successful, prohibition, woman suffrage, and popular election of United States senators have been made mandatory throughout the nation by constitutional law. Some state passed a pure food law. It furnished a type of protection which modern society greatly needed. Other states passed similar laws and before a great time had elapsed a federal pure food law was enacted showing that the United States government had recognized a new obligation to the people of the nation. A few years ago Wisconsin passed a law creating a public service commission. To-day practically all the states have public service commissions through their own voluntary action. North Dakota is now trying a social scheme known as the non-partisan league. Oklahoma is working out some peculiar problems in politics. Other states are trying new plans in education, children's codes, labor laws, industrial courts, and so forth. Our country makes progress in this way. We are extremely fortunate in being able to try a social or political theory without injury to the whole country. State history which occupies its field and gives a record of these social experiments becomes of great importance, not only to the state for which it is written, but to the entire country.

State history treated from the viewpoint of the more complete development of the community life and activity of the people usually presents three large phases or periods. First is the pioneer period, which begins with the first English or American settlements and extends through the organization of the state government until such time as division of labor together with social, industrial, and economic organization changes the pioneer community to a more stable and a more highly organized group. The second period is one of transition. It begins with the close of the pioneer period and continues until such time as the state recognizes its responsibility in directing the coöperative work of society through such machinery of state government as state departments, state institutions, state boards, and state commissions. The third period of state history has its

beginning with the close of the second period and traces the activity of the state as a great social organization either directing and doing the coöperative work of society through its institutions, boards, and commissions, or legalizing and protecting voluntary organizations of citizens who organize to do such work as can be done better through coöperative than individual effort.

The periods of state history gradually merge into one another as do all historical periods, but approximate dates may usually be found which mark them sufficiently well for the organization of historical data. I can best make clear my meaning by tracing briefly these three prominent phases of state history in my own state, Missouri. In Missouri the pioneer period begins with the beginning of American sovereignty in 1804 and closes in 1836. The period is marked by the organization of pioneer communities, the first churches, the first schools, the first lodges, the Americanization of the lead-mining community of southeast Missouri, the organization and development of the fur trade which extended from St. Louis as a center to the Pacific ocean, the beginning and extension of the Santa Fé trade, and especially the extension of settlements and the increase of population from 10,000 in 1804 to about 300,000 in 1836. The outstanding event of the period was the organization of the state government in 1820.

The change from the pioneer to the transition period in Missouri history is marked by several events in the year 1836 and the years immediately preceding and following that year. The Platte purchase, which rounded out Missouri's territorial boundaries, was made in 1836. The first railroad convention was held in the same year. The public school system of the state was provided for by an act of the legislature passed in 1835. The penitentiary, the first state institution, was established in 1833. The first state bank was chartered in 1837. And the act creating the state university, the second institution of the state, was passed in 1839. The period of transition in Missouri history extends from 1836 to 1870. At the beginning of this period Missouri was a frontier state; at its close it was the center state in the United States. It was a period of won-

derful economic development, rise in land values, increase in population, and development in transportation, both by steamboat and railroad. All the important churches established statewide organizations during this period of development, but little was done in social organizations outside the field of religion. The beginnings were made in voluntary coöperative organizations. The state teachers' association, the state medical association and the state agricultural association were organized in the later part of the period. In the field of education the state had not recognized its responsibility. Although the public school system and the state university had been created at the beginning of the period, the public schools never enrolled one-half the children in the state during the period and the university received its first appropriation from the public funds (the sum of \$10,000) in 1867. Three more state institutions, a school for the deaf, a school for the blind, and a hospital for the insane, were established in the later part of the period.

The third period, from 1870 to the present time, is characterized by creation and rapid development of voluntary coöperative associations of cultural, vocational, or social nature. The later part of this period has been marked by the activity of the state in doing and supervising the work of society. This is especially noticeable in the field of education, in the care of the unfortunate, and in the supervision of industries. The five state institutions of 1870 have been increased to twenty-three, and in addition forty-three boards and commissions have been created. The tendency at the present time is to decrease the number of boards and commissions by consolidation, but the coöperative work done by the state is being increased rather than diminished. Any state history dealing with this third period should give a historic sketch of the coöperative work of such voluntary statewide organizations as the state teachers' association, the state agricultural association, organized labor, the federation of commercial clubs, the tuberculosis association, the state medical association, the state press association, the anti-saloon league, women's clubs, and the women's Christian temperance league. Likewise the history of this period should sketch the history of the work of the state institutions and

such boards and commissions as the state board of health, the public service commission, the state highway board, and others whose work is of importance to society.

State history written in such a way as to treat adequately the various lines of development in a state could be used as a basis for the study of social, political, and civic development of community life. State history is the only subject that can furnish a practical textbook for such work. A textbook for each community in each or any one of the social studies is clearly impossible. A textbook in community civics, sociology, or economics that will fit all communities is so general as to be of little use below the college. The state is the creator and protector of all communities, and all community activities. State history is, therefore, the logical background for the study of such activities.

The state history should be supplemented in each community by local history. This local history should be developed along the chief lines of community interest. Local history is a field that is but little worked in this country. As a people we care little for our history. Family history is neglected. Few Americans can tell anything about their great grandparents. Community history is seldom thought of and yet there are usually a few people in every community who could easily be interested in community history. If the leaders in historical study would devote some attention to the field of local history I believe they would be well paid for the effort. This field of local history could probably be best cultivated by the state historical society working through the teachers of history in the high schools of the state. The high school teacher is not a trained research worker in history, but usually he has studied some history. In our state, a teacher of history in an approved high school must have had at least ten semester hours of college history. At least the history teacher must face the problem of teaching history. Working through the history teacher a local branch of the state historical society could probably be organized with anywhere from a half dozen to a dozen or more members. Membership in this local society should carry with it membership in the state society so that each member would get the state

publication. This in time would develop a sort of historical attitude in the community that would be valuable. The members of the society could write papers upon the leading historic events, persons, and organizations connected with the community. Duplicate copies of all such papers should be made, one of which should be filed with the secretary of the local society for use in the schools or other community groups when needed and the other sent to the state historical society for preservation. In this way, history that is continually being lost would be in form for use and future reference. Community history could be developed and used to supplement state history in teaching history, community civics, sociology, economics, and so forth. There would be a group of people in each community who would have their attention directed to the collection and preservation of the historic material in the community. This would prevent a great deal of wanton destruction of historic material now going on in this country which is probably less excusable than the destruction of the Alexandrian library by the Mohammedans.

In conclusion I would like to point out that even as the state is an organization which stands between the individual and the nation and touches the life of the average citizen many times where the nation touches it once, so state history logically furnishes the connecting link between the individual and national history and is essential in our system of instruction in history. But if state history is to fill this place it must be much more complete than state history has been in the past. It must not only give a history of the political development of the state, but it must deal adequately with the institutional and group life devoted to the industrial, economic, and social development of the people. This life, which is created, fostered, and protected by the state, can be best understood by the pupil in general in the study of state history; but this study, to be made vital to the student, must be supplemented by the similar local history of his own community even as the general principles of the physical sciences must be made clear by laboratory work.

CLARENCE H. MCCLURE

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE TEACHERS' COLLEGE
WARRENSBURG

POPULARIZING STATE HISTORY

Popularizing state history is profitable as well as educational. Any commonwealth which exploits well its own annals has an advantage in retaining its population and in attracting new citizens. Fortunate is that state which has a vital history, but more fortunate is the state which has vitalized that history. To exploit material greatness is no longer considered improper, if in truth it ever was; to exploit human greatness is even more appropriate. America's greatest asset is not her natural resources, it is rather her national historical heritage. A people without a past or without knowledge of a past is handicapped. The stabilizing forces of precedent are lacking, the problem of former decades is forgotten, past victories and defeats, except on the field of war, fail to serve as guides and warnings. Still more regrettable for such a people is the absence of well poised pride. Popularizing history, especially state history, bears or should bear no import of provincial chauvinism. The latter is, in fact, usually strongest and most damaging where accurate history has not been democratized. The demagogue's appeal finds fertile soil there. Not so among a people who have been instructed in their own annals.

The east along the Atlantic seaboard *may* learn something from the west; the west *is* profiting much from the east. Just as New York state is awakening to the widespread dissemination of Massachusetts history and the comparative oblivion of its own history in revolutionary days, so is the Mississippi valley realizing that its people have more knowledge of Salem witchcraft than of the great St. Louis fur trade. New England was early converted to the principle of popularizing local history. So well has she succeeded that every American school boy and girl knows a remarkable number of even rather minor characters and incidents native to her section, however ignorant he may be of even the most important men and successes of his own state. The west can well learn from the east, not history, but the art and work of popularizing history.

In the east that art had its inception early. The oldest historical organization in America is the Massachusetts historical society. That society with its learned and public spirited supporters diffused an influence far reaching. America's textbooks on United States history, until recently, might have been copyrighted, stamped, and labeled — "Made in New England — for the remainder of America." All honor to New England's glorious history; greater honor to New England's historical societies and historians. What the west and the middle west lack is not history but popularized history. The latter seems harder to obtain than the former was to make. Why? Because people acting collectively have to make history, good or bad; but they are not forced to know history. They leave this to the seers and singers, forgetting that the age of saga authorship is past. To-day, it is as necessary to have collective support of a people to foster the popularization of state history as it is to popularize a political movement. To obtain strength and support, one must, in a democracy, go to the people to popularize any movement that affects all.

No state can expect to popularize its history without a central directing agency. A state historical society, commission, or department serves as a logical instrument. But the existence of such an institution or organization marks only the bare inception of work. Most commonwealths have these, and many have stopped here. A historical society which entombs its library, services, and publications, in even the most pretentious quarters, is not unlike a country rich in natural resources which remains undeveloped. The benefit to the people in both cases is largely potential. Both are inclined to live in the past, for the benefit of the future, at the expense of the present. Is there a workable plan, retentive of the good in the old and receptive of the dynamic in the new? Missouri's experience is illustrative.

Founded in 1898, becoming a state institution in 1899, the State historical society of Missouri, at Columbia, began its real work in 1901 on receiving its first state biennial appropriation of \$4,500. Its active existence covers twenty years. Three-fourths of this period was devoted to collecting a library on Missouri and western history, publishing a quarterly, and com-

piling bibliographies. The historical collection work was invaluable, but it affected the popularizing of state history little. When I was promoted from assistant librarian to secretary in 1915, our active membership and the paid circulation of our *Review* was around four hundred and had remained there for years despite a hundred additions biennially. It appeared that we were depopularizing history at the cost of twenty-five per cent of our members every two years. We were covering the state negatively. I began to question our progressiveness in realizing our opportunity. Critics regarded as authorities informed me that the field was limited, that five or six hundred was the highest goal obtainable in Missouri. They said that Wisconsin or Minnesota with societies half a century old, with large appropriations, with fine publications, might go higher than these figures, but Missouri could not compete with these states. Moreover, they maintained that in any state there were few persons, not over a thousand, who were interested in local history. If this were true, I felt that I had embarked in a poor life-work. But was it true, despite statistics and authority? I first attempted to analyze historical society work, both in and outside Missouri, from the viewpoint of a scholar who had spent six years on one historical monograph, and then I tried to obtain the attitude of the teacher, the merchant, the banker, and the man of business. From the scholar's vantage, these institutions, or the leading ones rather, were doing their work. In short, it was an easy matter to sell a historical society to a scholar. But where was the inducement to buy on the part of the business man? Among my friends were bankers, lawyers, merchants, and professional men; I had taught in the grades, the high school, and the university. After investigation, I realized that many historical publications held little direct appeal to the average American citizen.

We began to change the policy of the *Missouri historical review* in 1916 and 1917. More readable articles were published and some attention was paid to connecting history with present day subjects. The world war opened a new field. In 1919 and 1920, Missouri's centennial revealed another opportunity. Our active membership and paid subscription list soon reached five

hundred, then seven hundred and fifty, then one thousand and to-day it is thirteen hundred — not including seven hundred exchange and editorial members — and increasing at the rate of more than fifty a month.¹ I believe this is the second largest number of active dues-paying members affiliated to-day with any state historical society in the United States. Six years ago this society held lower rank, around fifteenth, in this respect. I can see no valid reason for a state historical society's ultimately having less than two thousand members. This is our goal for 1921 alone and within five years at least five thousand. It should be clearly stated, however, that although we do regard a large active paid membership as a very important indication of the value of the society's educational service to our commonwealth, it is not an end in itself. It is a firm foundation on which other valuable structures may be built, such as preserving historical records, founding local societies, stimulating scholarship in the historical field, and encouraging historical contributions in the form of monographs, pamphlets, and books. We are not forwarding popularization at the expense of scholarship, rather we are advancing scholarship through the medium of educating our democracy.

It is, perhaps, necessary to clear away erroneous concepts regarding the inanity of the popular and the dryness of the scholarly. A historical article or a magazine for general reading can be and should be accurate, scholarly, and interesting — popular. A scholarly article need not be dry; in fact, in the field of history it is faulty if it is dry. But a so-called popular article is not always interesting and unfortunately is frequently inaccurate. Some of our best historians, our most original and scholarly, have been popular authors. Parkman, Thwaites, Turner, Roosevelt, to mention only a few, have written interestingly and with vigor. All grant them credit for serious research. Their labors, however, have never dulled their pens.

The importance of an interesting historical magazine is second only to that of a central historical directing agency in popularizing state history. Both are necessary but each must be exploited. The means and manner of action are varied. The

¹ On January 1, 1923, the paid subscription list was 1,649.

advertising methods employed by commercial organizations are worthy of consideration. The good will and active support of state-wide bodies are helpful. The coöperation of authors, journalists, and leading local historians should be cultivated. The organization of local historical societies with dual membership features should be advanced. These are merely suggestive of the many plans of attack. It is assumed that such fundamentals as courtesy, helpful information, and free service must be observed. One of the most important means employed in this work is to give the central directing agency a personality. Most people regard history as another "dead language." Life must be breathed into it. This accomplished, effort must be concentrated in having the historical society generally regarded as a clearing house of data and work in its field and even beyond its field. If these rules be observed and patiently adhered to, progress is made and the results are satisfying.

In sixteen years, from 1901 to 1916, inclusive, the biennial state support of the state historical society of Missouri rose from \$4,500 to only \$12,600 or about one-third of the amount needed and requested. From 1916 to 1921, it rose from \$12,600 to \$39,770. Indifference to state history characterized the average Missouri legislator during the former period. Little progress had been made in popularizing our local annals. An active and aggressive interest in Missouri history marked the latter years. Any state official can appreciate the difficult and embarrassing situation of appealing for thirty minutes to a joint appropriations committee of twenty to thirty legislators, having few questions asked which do not indicate either ignorance or indifference to the work his institution is performing, and finally leaving the hearing with an appropriation made more on the basis of charity than on character of service. He can also appreciate the different situation where the queries are constructive, where the room is crowded with legislators and their wives, where the spirit of coöperation is manifest, and where open applause closes the hearing. It is significant that more than ten per cent of the members of the recent legislature of Missouri were members of the state historical society.

In 1901 there was only one textbook on Missouri history.

To-day there are four, and all are worth while, besides Missouri history supplementary readers.² The effect is seen again in the local and metropolitan press in Missouri. As an illustration: within two weeks, March 20 to April 3, three entire articles—all rather long—from the *Missouri historical review* were reproduced in three of Missouri's largest metropolitan papers without suggestion on our part. Again: the *Kansas City Star*, after receiving but probably not saving the old numbers of the *Review*, placed an order this year for a complete set of the *Review* for its library. The rural press has responded equally well. In short, it is becoming nothing unusual for the best editors in the state to pay attention to the field of state history since they have learned that their readers are interested. The effect of this effort to popularize state history is observed in the increased number of woman's club programs on Missouri history and in the featuring of this subject in the public schools. Curiously enough, even politicians and statesmen in their addresses have not failed to observe this trend. One candidate for the legislature, the Honorable S. F. O'Fallon, voluntarily recommended to his audience in his political speeches last fall that every Missourian affiliate with the State historical society, help it organize county societies, and promote the study of Missouri history in schools and clubs. Mr. O'Fallon was, of course, a member of the state society, but he had never visited its headquarters in Columbia. He became speaker of the Missouri house of representatives.

I would not point to the State historical society of Missouri as the model institution of its kind. In fact, the conditions in each commonwealth are rarely duplicated in any other. This is true in counties. We in Missouri have tried to invoice our assets and liabilities, our exploited fields and our field of opportunity. Our policies have been based upon and guided by the results of that inventory. One of these policies was to popularize Missouri state history. So far, that policy has resulted in better historical publications, better textbooks, better teachers trained in Missouri history, greater coöperation of citizens and organizations, more county historical societies, a larger and

² In 1922 another textbook on Missouri history was published.

better historical library, a better *Missouri historical review*, more adequate state support, and an ever increasing number of citizens actively interested in forwarding historical education in the state.

FLOYD C. SHOEMAKER

THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MISSOURI
COLUMBIA

THE MOHEGAN INDIANS EAST AND WEST

In the struggle within historic times for the privilege of developing the resources of the western hemisphere, the Indians have been ever the heirs of misfortune. They have not been major factors in the transfer of their heritage to others. Upon them has rested and must rest the stigma of inferiority, a status perchance due to retardation by climatic conditions in an earlier habitat and the disregard of their isolation before they had achieved the mastery of their resources.

In the more northern portions of America the aborigines fared somewhat better than in South and Central America, where the exploitation of the conquistadors, despite the generally futile resistance of the natives, reduced most of them promptly and permanently to a condition approaching or exemplifying misery. However, in the temperate regions of North America and northward, which Spain did not and probably could not occupy, there ensued a keen competition between the chief non-Iberian powers of western Europe, first in the preëmption of desirable locations on and near the Atlantic seaboard, and later in crowding or driving each other from any desirable portions of the continent. In such a process the Indians could command such consideration as might be dictated by expediency or temporary necessity. Nevertheless the Indian tribes were nearly all sooner or later and in varying degrees jostled from their ancestral and frequently from later transient homes. Occasionally tribes living on or near international frontiers, in effect auctioned off their adherence to one or another bidder, and purchased thereby a temporary immunity.

One group of Indians, the Iroquois or Five Nations, largely through their shrewdness in taking advantage of this opportunity in combination with superior strength and natural position, secured a preëminence among the aborigines. Interesting indeed would be the full story of the development of the Iroquois confederacy, located at the strategic heart of the continent east

of the Rockies, probably more ancient when Champlain became its first white visitor than is the United States under the constitution to-day, and so closely knit as to defy both attack and intrigue throughout its known history. Though it finally wore away to a remnant through attrition, it is still seated in the wreckage of its former empire. Its power grew like that of Rome by the incorporation of individuals and the subjugation of peoples. From their capital a few day's journey took messengers or war parties, as they chose, to the great radiating arteries of communication, the Great lakes and the St. Lawrence basin, the Hudson, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and the Ohio valleys. And other natural highways beyond these opened into northern Canada, New England, the country south of the Potomac, and the great Mississippi valley.

The Mohegans, of whom this paper treats, were one of the tribes of the Algonquin group. A Wisconsin Indian, of a tribe containing Mohegan blood, anglicized as John W. Quinney, only a generation ago, gave the following sketch of the traditional history of his tribe, which in the absence of contemporary written records may be worthy of consideration:

"A great people came from the North-West: crossed over the salt-waters, and after long and weary pilgrimages, (planting many colonies on their track), took possession, and built their fires upon the Atlantic coast, extending from the Delaware on the south, to the Penobscot on the north. They became, in process of time, divided into different tribes and interests; all, however, speaking one common dialect. This great confederacy, comprising Delawares, Munsees, Mohegans, Narragansetts, Pequots, Penobscots and many others, (of whom a few are now scattered among the distant wilds of the West—others supporting a weak, tottering existence; while, by far, a larger remainder have passed that bourne to which their brethren are tending,) held its Council once a year, to deliberate on the general welfare." Mr. Quinney adds that "Housatonic River Indians, Mohegans, Manhattas, were all names of bands in different localities, but bound together, as one family, by blood, marriage and descent."¹

¹ For John Quinney's account of his race, see John N. Davidson, *Muh-he-ka-ne-ok*,

Mr. Quinney's own tribe, the Mahicans, a branch of the Mohegans, anciently ranged from the vicinity of Poughkeepsie to that of Lake Champlain, and eastward to the Housatonic valley in Massachusetts, whither their council fire was removed in 1664. Many of the Mahicans, finding the Hudson valley untenable in the following years, entered Massachusetts and were known as the Stockbridge Indians. Others in the eighteenth century preceded the whites to Indiana and Ohio. Still other contingents dallied on the upper Susquehanna in Pennsylvania and in adjacent parts of New York. They no longer occupy their ancient home on the Hudson. At Stockbridge the Massachusetts government encouraged the congregating of the Mahicans and of a considerable body of the Iroquois who migrated thither in the middle of the eighteenth century, coming from as far as the Susquehanna valley.²

The more eastern branch of the Mohegans, whose history now concerns us, were the chief Connecticut tribe after the Pequots, who claimed jurisdiction over them, had been crushed in 1637 by the whites aided by neighboring tribes. The Mohegans then established their capital at the head of the Thames river, absorbed part of the Pequots into their own tribal organization, and claimed the lands of that tribe in eastern Connecticut.³ Like their Indian neighbors isolated in southeastern New England, the Mohegans had only the alternatives of coming to grips with the newcomers or of seeking safety in friendship with the powerful invaders. The Mohegans chose to be the friends and allies of the English. This was not unnatural since the tribe was then weak in numbers through the recent ravages of the smallpox.⁴ Too weak to stand alone in competition with

a history of the Stockbridge nation (Milwaukee, 1893), pp. viii, ix. See also for support of Mr. Quinney's statements the map of linguistic families of American Indians north of Mexico by J. W. Powell, published at the end of part 1 of the *Handbook of American Indians, north of Mexico* (Bureau of American ethnology, Bulletin no. 30, edited by Frederick M. Hodge. — Washington, 1907-1910).

² *Ibid.*, part 1, pp. 786-787; John W. De Forest, *History of the Indians of Connecticut from the earliest known period to 1850* (Hartford, 1851), 59; *Journal of the Massachusetts house of representatives*, December 7, 1749, p. 107, January 29, 1759, p. 139, February 6, 1750, pp. 152-153, October 2, 1751, p. 52, January 27, 1752.

³ George L. Clark, *A history of Connecticut, its people and institutions* (New York, 1914), 30, 46.

⁴ William Bradford, *History of the Plimoth plantation* (Boston, 1901), 388, 402.

other tribes or with the English, following the will-o'-the-wisp of English magnanimity, the Mohegans played the tragic rôle of the weak who seek to purchase the friendship of the strong, although they have nothing to offer which can be given without irreparable loss. In the case of this locally important tribe, aside from a limited trade, their possessions of value to the English were their lives to be risked in war and the lands which supplied their homes.

Had the process of eviction which followed been conducted in the unobtrusive manner which has left such scanty accessible records of the dispossession of so many other tribes, its story would be brief and relatively unenlightening. This evolution, however, differed from others, more or less similar in other respects, in that it became an issue before the British government and was given thereby a dignity equal to that of boundary disputes between colonies. Before this occurred the sachem Uncas in 1640 ceded to the Connecticut government the heart of that province except a tract reserved for planting and hunting, "for five yards of cloth and a few pairs of stockings."⁵

Other grants of portions of the land claimed by the Mohegans in 1637 followed in bewildering profusion. Such grants were made by the sachem Uncas to John Mason in 1659 and in 1665. The recipient thereupon reconveyed to the Indians in 1671 a portion of what he held, with a proviso that none of these lands should be alienated without his consent. Uncas also ceded in 1659 a district nine miles square to the town of Norwich. In 1681 a new grant was made by the Mohegan sachem of all the remaining tribal lands to the colonial government. He was to be allowed "reasonable satisfaction" for lands when used, and the tribe was always to enjoy ample lands for planting.⁶

Meanwhile the Mohegans valiantly but fatuously helped Connecticut to destroy King Philip, the only effective check upon

⁵ "Commission of review," in *The Talcott papers*, vol. 2 (Connecticut historical society, *Collections*, vol. 5), 19; "Declaration of Ben Uncas and his tribe," *ibid.*, 40; Clark, *History of Connecticut*, 178.

⁶ "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," in *Talcott papers*, 2: 143; *Mohegan Extra*, June 16, 1842, p. 1; *The public records of the colony of Connecticut, volume 1, 1636-1665* (edited by J. Hammond Trumbull — Hartford, 1850), 309-311, 393.

the controlling self-interest of the English. Thereupon the Connecticut general court voted to provide Uncas with a Bible; and shortly after, the town of Norwich referred to that now nearly landless sachem as "an old friend."⁷

The crisis came with the passage of an act by the Connecticut general court "dispossessing [it was alleged] the Mohegan Indians of certain lands which they had reserved for themselves." The primary active opponents of the aggressive policy of the provincial government, then and later, were members of the Mason family, the descendants and heirs of John Mason who had earlier received large grants of Mohegan lands. The Masons played the part of guardians of the interests of the Indians, a function which the general court had earlier assigned to them. On the other hand the governor of Connecticut accused the family of holding and treating those lands as though wholly the property of themselves and their friends. The behavior of the Masons, however, was not wholly what would be expected of unscrupulous despoilers.⁸

Protests to the home government against the appropriation of the Indian lands led to the declaration of the English attorney-general in 1704 that the action of Connecticut was illegal and void. In 1705 a commission named by the crown to pass upon the issue, rendered a judgment favorable to the Indians. This commission also named John Mason as the guardian of the tribe at their request.⁹

The Connecticut government shortly complained to the crown of the judgment of this commission as oppressive and injurious,

⁷ *Mohegan Extra*, June 16, 1842, p. 3.

⁸ Shirley to Newcastle, March 1, 1736, *C. O.* 5, 899, p. 151, in the Public record office, London; "Commission of review," in *Talcott papers*, 2:19; Talcott to Francis Wilks, June 6, 1739, *ibid.*, 140, 143; "Report of the board of trade, June 10, 1736," *ibid.*, 475; "Declaration of Indians of the Mohegan tribe," *ibid.*, 485; "Representation and Certificate of the proceedings upon a Hearing by Commission in May & June 1738 [The Mohegan Indians against the Govr & Comp^y of Connecticut] By two of the Commiss^{rs} (Members of the Council of New York) dated 10th August 1738," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 2 (1738-1744), in the New York public library.

⁹ "Report of the board of trade, June 10, 1736," in *Talcott papers*, 2:475; "Commission of review," *ibid.*, 19-20; "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," *ibid.*, 140-147; Shirley to Newcastle, October, 1735, *C. O.* 5, 899, March 1, 1736, *C. O.* 5, 899, p. 151.

and prayed for a remedy. This led to the naming of a new commission in 1706 to review the case, but they failed to act, and the judgment in favor of the Indians was not carried out. This threw the initiative upon the Indians, and about 1735 William Shirley, a strong supporter of imperial interests in America became interested in the matter as counsel for the Indians and also as a royal official. He was then advocate-general of the court of vice-admiralty for the northern district. Shirley explained the situation to the Duke of Newcastle, who was then, in March, 1736, the secretary of state in charge of the colonies. In his letter to the duke, he declared "the Indians have not only been amus'd with fruitless promises, but further incroachments have been made upon the lands now left 'em: and they are in danger of falling off from the English, to whom your Grace will perceive by the inclosed . . . they have ever been faithful friends and allies in all their wars with the French and Indians, which would be of mischievous consequence to His Majesty's settlements here in time of war."¹⁰

Shirley was both an able and a trusted servant of the crown, and his patron, Newcastle, was a dominating figure in the clique of politicians who then ruled England. It therefore seems very probable that the views expressed in these documents brought about the issue of a new commission on June 3, 1737, "to Reexamine, Review, Finally Decide and Determine the whole Cause."¹¹

Shirley's viewpoint in the matter was imperial, that of Connecticut provincial. Neighboring colonies shielded her and the problem of defense gave her no serious concern. The military force of the Mohegans was moderate, but within a decade after Shirley sent his letter of information and suggestion to Newcastle bodies of friendly New England Indians recruited from isolated tribes like the Mohegans were rendering the English very valuable service in their war with the French.

By the time that the commission assembled in May, 1738,

¹⁰ *Ibid.* See also "The case of the Indians," *C. O.* 5, 899, p. 152; "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," in *Talcott papers*, 2: 148-149.

¹¹ "Commission of review," *ibid.*, 21; George A. Wood, *William Shirley, governor of Massachusetts, 1741-1746, a history* (New York, 1920), vol. 1, chapter 2 and *passim*.

the appropriation of the Indian lands had been sanctified by a possession so extended as to cause the liveliest feelings of resentment at the suggestion that the territory should be restored.¹² The real issue then joined was between the crown, seeking Indian allies, and the province, no longer valuing allies, seeking land. One may well wonder what status the untrained and often besotted minds of those members of the tribe who appeared in the court of the royal commissioners as auditors attributed to themselves. Whatever their reflections may have been it is not likely that they fully realized that they were only technically concerned in the case; that they were but pawns in a game with the rules of which they were wholly unacquainted.

Two New York councillors and the governor of Rhode Island and six of his assistants comprised the commission which met in May, 1738, to settle the Mohegan difficulty. The procedure and legal theories which they quickly developed well exemplified the capacity of American courts, however unlearned in the law, to evade or thwart the royal will. By the commission of review they were directed to summon before them the governor and company of Connecticut and the chief sachem of the Mohegans and other parties of right. They in fact summoned "the Gov^t and C^o of Connecticutt, . . . the Chief Sachem & the *principall heads of y^e Mohegan Indians*, and all others of the Tribe who had any Right to y^e Land in Controversy, and . . . the *Tenants in possession of y^e Lands in Controversy*" to appear before the court at Norwich in the Mohegan country later in the month. The court then adjourned to that place and time. Meanwhile the return upon the summons sent to the Indians stated that the chief sachem had been summoned if a chief sachem there was.¹³

Before the court the lieutenant-governor of Connecticut construed the commission of review to mean that unless the chief sachem of the tribe was produced the colony had no adversary. At this point William Shirley and William Bollan, both able lawyers who had been thoroughly trained in England, appeared

¹² Talcott to Wilks, August 9, 1740, in *Talcott papers*, 2: 282.

¹³ "Commission of review," *ibid.*, 21-22; "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," *ibid.*, 150-151; "Representation and Certificate . . . dated 10th August 1738," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 2.

as counsel for the Indians, and argued that the summons had really included the whole tribe of Mohegans and that their rights were involved. They then sought to present to the court matters dealt with in the hearing of 1705. They declared that the sachems had made several conveyances of tribal lands in trust with the consent of the Indians to members of the Mason family, who were to hold them as the guardians and protectors of the tribe and their interests. They added that these transfers had been confirmed by acts of the legislature, that the boundaries had been surveyed and that lands had been reserved for the tribe forever.¹⁴

They then stated that for many years the tribe had been greatly dissatisfied with their chief sachems, that some of those chosen sachems had betrayed or tried to betray to the government of Connecticut the interest and property of the tribe in the lands in controversy, that there had been several long intervals in which no chief sachem was chosen or serving as such, and that for some time back the majority of the tribe had determined to have no chief sachem.¹⁵

At this point the agents of the Connecticut general court interrupted to insist that in the absence of a chief sachem no one could have authority to act for the tribe. A majority of the Rhode Island commissioners approved this conclusion. This led Mr. Horsmanden of New York to observe "how absurd the conduct of the commissioners would be, if they denied themselves the means of information as to the merits of this case, by an inspection and examination of the judgment they were to review, and the proceedings upon which it was grounded, which he apprehended to be the principal and main matter directed by His Majesty's Commission." He urged further that an effective presentation of the case for the Indians must require reference to matters dealt with in that judgment. The New Yorkers held that "the court ought rather to regard the merits of the case than matter of form." They also thought that if the proceedings of 1705 established that the Masons held the lands in controversy for the Indians in trust "all further enquiry touching the chief sachim or sachimship, . . . must have been

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

looked upon as altogether needless." The warm argument was terminated by the decision of the majority, consisting of the Rhode Island commissioners, "that the chief sachim should first be found and appear, upon this reasoning, that if there were no chief sachim, the tribe could not appear, for that would be a body without a head."¹⁶

As the hearing of the case continued the court demanded of Shirley and Bollan "whether they knew of any chief sachim," and they "declared that John Unchas . . . was chief sachim if any there was." Thereupon the agents for Connecticut asserted that Ben Uncas was chief sachem. Each of these claimants of the honor declared himself to be chief sachem and the court then took evidence upon the point.¹⁷

The Connecticut government had astutely prepared for this contingency as early as November, 1737. The governor then laid before the council in very frank language a plan centering about the acceptance of Ben Uncas as sachem. Much of the groundwork for this scheme was laid in an alleged "Declaration of the Mohegan tribe" of April, 1738, in which eleven Mohegans apparently ratified substantially the proposals of the governor including an acknowledgement of just treatment from the colonial government in all matters including the lands in dispute, and a repudiation of the sachemship of those Mohegan chiefs who had been opponents of the Connecticut claims. Shortly after this Francis Wilks, the agent of the colony in England, suggested that the sachem "Appear before the Commissioners, disclaim the Petition upon which the Commission Issued, . . . Consent to a Reversal of the former Sentence" and to one in favor of Connecticut, which procedure, he thought, would "make a Short, Easy and Perfect end of this Affair."¹⁸

There is also good reason for believing that there was an un-

¹⁶ "Representation and Certificate . . . dated 10th August 1738," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*; "Petition of Samuel Mason, trustee for the tribe of Mohegan Indians in America," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 3.

¹⁸ Governor Talcott to the council, November 29, 1737, in *Talcott papers*, 2: 34-37; "Declaration of Indians of the Mohegan tribe," *ibid.*, 485-489; Wilks to Talcott, May 3, 1738, *ibid.*, 47.

derstanding favorable to the claims of Connecticut between the officials of that colony and the Rhode Island commissioners.¹⁹

Connecticut supported Ben Uncas as *chief sachem de facto* while Shirley and Bollan maintained "the title of John Unchas as *sachem de jure*." While witnesses upon this issue were being examined the counsel for the Indians made a motion "that the tribe of the Mohegan Indians there present might be admitted to declare whether there was any sachem of the said tribe." John Sharpe, a prominent English lawyer who served as counsel for Connecticut before the home government in this case, later declared this motion one of "the most extraordinary out of the way motions I ever met with;" and again, "an insulting, tumultuous motion."²⁰

The Rhode Islanders denied this motion and thereupon Mr. Horsmanden ordered "his dissent from the Resolution upon the last motion to be entered in the minutes." Shirley and Bollan then moved "That the Indians summoned to appear at the court, by virtue of the process issued for that purpose and then present might be heard relating to Ben Unchas's being in fact or of right chief sachim and in like manner to be heard relating to John Unchas's being chief sachim of the said tribe." This motion thoroughly aroused John Sharpe who fulminated "and was ever such a thing heard of before as of a whole tribe or nation to come into a court and to insist to be heard by themselves And could this be done with any other view than to brow beat insult and menace the court and to overawe and terrify 'em into a compliance with their unreasonable demands. It was a barefaced shameful and tumultuous attempt and I am very glad the court had resolution enough to withstand it."²¹

Horsmanden, however, dissented from this action of the court. Thereupon the Rhode Island commissioners suggested hearing six witnesses for each side and this was agreed to. These wit-

¹⁹ Talcott to the council, November 29, 1737, *ibid.*, 36; Peter Bours to Talcott, March 14, 1738, *ibid.*, 94-97; "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," *ibid.*, 154-159; "Petition of the Mohegan Indians," *ibid.*, 160.

²⁰ John Sharpe to Wilks, not dated, *ibid.*, 108, 110.

²¹ "Representation and Certificate . . . dated 10th August 1738," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 2; Sharpe to Wilks, *Talcott papers*, 2: 111.

nesses testified according to report, (1) that from the coming of the English the sachemship had been hereditary from father to son in the Uncas family; (2) that John Uncas was the next male heir to Mahomet, lately dead, and therefore legal sachem, since the Connecticut general court had approved Mahomet as sachem; (3) that Ben Uncas, after being chosen by part of the tribe had been deposed by a majority of them in September, 1736, for disposing of the lands of the tribe to Connecticut, as it was alleged without authority; (4) that in 1737 when the Mohegans asked protection of Connecticut against the eastern Indians they were told it would be given only on their agreeing to acknowledge Ben Uncas as sachem; (5) that on August 2, 1737, a document was signed by the Indians acknowledging Ben Uncas as sachem, although a witness thought the Indians did not understand what they were signing; (6) that a large part of the Indians signed a paper in March, 1738, repudiating this acknowledgement. After hearing the testimony of these witnesses "the court nevertheless gave judgment that Ben Uncas was chief sachem of the Mohegan Indians." Thereupon Mr. Horsmanden and Mr. Cortlandt again dissented.²²

The plot thickened when the counsel with the Connecticut officials moved on behalf of Ben Uncas that three specified lawyers might appear for him in the case. This request was granted. Shirley and Bollan then moved "That the tribe of Mohegan Indians might be admitted to appear, and, by such persons as they should name, be heard in support of their claims and interest in the lands contained in the . . . judgment which was to be reviewed by the commissioners." Upon denial of this motion they moved "That the last motion and resolution thereupon might be recorded." This the Rhode Islanders denied and declared "That the clerk should enter nothing but what the commissioners directed." When the New Yorkers directed their dissent from this decision to be recorded, the Rhode Island commissioners refused to allow it a place in the record.²³

Shirley and Bollan then moved on behalf of the tribe and John Mason their guardian "that Mr. Mason might be admitted

²² Sharpe to Wilks, *Talcott papers*, 2:111-112; "Representation and Certificate . . . dated 10th August 1738," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 2.

²³ *Ibid.*

to appear as guardian for the chief sachim and tribe." In support of this motion they offered to show that the Masons were legally the trustees of the Indians in regard to the lands at issue. In this connection Horsmanden succeeded after insistence in having the former judgment upon the controversy produced. This document contained the essential facts related above in regard to the disputed title to the lands. But the commissioners voted not to hear Mason nor his counsel.²⁴

Those recognized as counsel for Ben Uncas then moved the reversal of the judgment of the former commission. Thereupon Horsmanden and Cortlandt protested, demanded that their protest be entered on the record, and withdrew from the commission, declaring that they saw from the conduct of the court that "a collusive defense of the Indians' title to the lands in controversy, was plainly . . . suffered to be made," and that the defense of the Indian title "was finally conducted by persons who appeared to be some of the principal members of the corporation of Connecticut; and therefore adversaries of the tribe of Indians." Following the retirement of these consistent dissentients, Ben Uncas and his tribe, it was alleged, acknowledged the deeds of conveyance and quit claim in controversy, and the court then entered judgment in favor of Connecticut, reversing the decision of the former commission. Mr. Sharpe declared that since they now had a judgment in their favor, they would oppose the naming of another commission of review to the utmost and he believed successfully.²⁵

The proceedings related above were the turning point in the contest at law over the Mohegan lands. Apparent legal rights over the disputed area were thus conferred upon Connecticut. The award of 1738 was substantially approved by a new commission in 1743.²⁶ Protracted efforts to secure a reversal were of no avail. Meanwhile the Mohegan lands in controversy were brought by the whites into conformity with the economic life which surrounded them. The Connecticut Mohe-

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.* See also "Petition of the Mohegan Indians," in *Talcott papers*, 2: 160-161; "Petition of Samuel Mason and his brother," *ibid.*, 152-158; Sharpe to Wilks, *ibid.*, 115.

²⁶ "Petition of Samuel Mason, trustee for the Mohegan Indians," Chalmers papers relating to Connecticut, vol. 3.

gans dwindled through migration to the less-developed west or through the hazards of civilized life.

The English government did no more, therefore, than to ratify what had long been a well-established status when on January 15, 1773, on the eve of the conflict which was to make such action meaningless, it dismissed the Mason appeal and affirmed the judgment of 1743.²⁷

On October 20, 1775, a new Indian nation was formed of fragments remaining from the wrecks of former tribes among whom were some Mohegans. The new tribe was called the Brothertowns, and reversing the current by which such streams of refugees had found their way into the relative safety of New England before the French had been ousted from Canada and the strength of the Six Nations had been broken, they, in 1785, made new homes for themselves in New Stockbridge, a settlement already erected by the Stockbridge Indians of Massachusetts upon lands donated by the Oneidas in New York. To this new settlement went in 1788 a considerable portion of the Mohegans of Connecticut, who thereafter formed the larger part of the community. The little remnant upon the shores of the Thames has since substantially ceased to exist as a group through assimilation into the stock, language and culture of their neighbors.²⁸

In 1818, a group of the New York Stockbridges sought a new home upon the lands of the Miami tribe in Indiana, but found these lands had meanwhile been sold to the federal government. For some years the majority of this group seem to have been wanderers in Ohio and Indiana. During this time the Reverend Eleazer Williams, the brilliant though unsuccessful mixed-blood descendant of the Reverend John Williams of Deerfield, Massachusetts, was fruitlessly attempting to promote grandiose plans for creating a new empire of the Six Nations and associated tribes upon the shores of Green Bay, Wisconsin.²⁹

The wandering Stockbridges, in 1822, found a home in that

²⁷ Clark, *History of Connecticut*, 178.

²⁸ Davidson, *History of the Stockbridge nation*, 16; *Handbook of American Indians* (Hodge, ed.), part 1, p. 926, part 2, p. 637; Albert G. Ellis, "Some account of the advent of the New York Indians into Wisconsin," in Wisconsin state historical society, *Collections*, 2: 416.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 417-429; Davidson, *History of the Stockbridge nation*, 16.

district, where they were soon joined by others of their nation. Here Stockbridges and Munsees merged into what has remained one tribe.³⁰ Their vicissitudes have been many. In 1839 the tribe sold half its reservation and agreed to move to lands to be assigned to them west of the Mississippi, upon which the tribal organization might be retained. A remainder were to become citizens and occupy a town on the eastern shore of Winnebago lake, Wisconsin. The migration of a part to the designated land near Leavenworth, Kansas, was soon followed by their return to Wisconsin and the restoration of tribal government. In 1856, after sloughing off a few who remained as citizens, the tribe removed to a reservation west of Shawano, Shawano county, Wisconsin, where in 1909, the united tribe numbered 582 persons. Interminable negotiations with the state and national governments regarding land and citizenship have failed to bring a definite settlement.³¹ This little reservation now seems to contain the chief surviving community of the Mohegan Indians. Other groups of Mohegan blood were, in the language of Mr. Quinney, "scattered among the distant wilds of the West." The history of such groups cannot be traced in this paper.

GEORGE A. WOOD

LAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

LAKE FOREST, ILLINOIS

³⁰ *Ibid.*; Ellis, "The advent of the New York Indians into Wisconsin," in Wisconsin state historical society, *Collections*, 2: 418-430, 449.

³¹ *Handbook of American Indians* (Hodge, ed.), part 2, p. 638.

THE CHARACTER AND LEADERSHIP OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

As long as the name of Abraham Lincoln is remembered that of Stephen A. Douglas will also be known. The careers of these rival leaders of the old northwest were so interwoven in the great period that culminated in the civil war, that immortality for Lincoln insures immortality for Douglas as well. That this is a fact has not proved to be a matter of unalloyed good fortune for Douglas. Indeed, his reputation has suffered because he must be constantly brought into contrast with his great contemporary. The host of lesser biographers of Lincoln, and multitudes of our Lincoln day orators, having a hero, must also have a villain for the drama. This latter part must be accepted by Douglas, for was he not the antagonist of the man who became "the great emancipator"? Turning to more worthy students of Lincoln, it is difficult to name a single scholarly biographer or interpreter of his life who has not made unjustifiable statements in disparagement of Douglas for the purpose of adding something to the stature of Lincoln.

Historical writers universally give high praise to Douglas for the qualities that he displayed during the last few years of his life, and more especially for his course of action during the last few weeks. Whether intentionally or not, their readers are given the impression that here was a man who in some remarkable manner suddenly acquired courage and character, wisdom and exalted patriotism, near the close of his life, in strong contrast to everything in his previous career. Even if it be admitted, as it must be, that he reached a higher plane of conduct from 1857 to 1861 than earlier, it should be remembered that he was but forty-four years of age when he took his stand against the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution and but forty-eight when death claimed him. Certainly approaching old age had nothing to do with his increase in moral stature,

for he had no idea that he was making his exit from the stage during the eventful years from 1857 to 1861.

Had the final summons come to Lincoln as early as to Douglas, he would have ended his labors in 1857. Only three years before had he struck his gait in connection with the great test question of the times. Before 1854, he had been a leader of the whig party in Illinois, urging the use of more effective campaign methods, supporting candidates and advocating policies that, taken by and large, were no better and no worse than those of the democratic party. Had Douglas been permitted as long a life as Lincoln, he would have lived to 1869. It is impossible to map out the course which Douglas would have followed had he lived through the great civil war and beyond, but it is manifestly unfair, considering his premature death, that his public career has been contrasted so unfavorably with that of Lincoln, who won his title to undying fame entirely for what he was and what he accomplished from the year 1854 forward. In that year he was exactly as old as was Douglas when the latter undertook the battle with President Buchanan and his backers over the Le-compton project.

The most intensely hostile criticism of Douglas has always centered about his part in the repeal of the Missouri compromise of 1820. In this connection he has been widely regarded as fundamentally lacking in moral strength. Most of those who have repudiated this sweeping condemnation have agreed that his solution of the question of slavery in the territories was demonstrated to be an utter failure, and therefore accept the view that the champion of popular sovereignty was a leader without foresight and statesmanship.¹

Able defenders of the position taken by Webster in his seventh of March speech have appeared in recent years, and it is now generally conceded that there was profound wisdom in the utterance: "I would not take the pains uselessly to reaffirm an ordinance of nature, nor to reenact the will of God." Of this principle Douglas became the heir and champion. He would remove the question of slavery in the territories from the halls of congress, and allow the people most concerned to determine the

¹ See, for example, Frank H. Hodder, "Genesis of the Kansas-Nebraska act," in Wisconsin historical society, *Proceedings*, 1912, p. 85.

status of slavery for themselves. This would leave it to the ordinances of nature, since the interests of the people in a territory would be determined by natural conditions.²

It is frequently contended to-day by students of our economic history that slavery would have disappeared within a generation had the civil war not occurred. However true this may be, it is plain that the only possible chance for economic forces to have had their way was through the continuance of a policy of compromise. The compromise measures of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska act satisfied the south for a brief period. After the failure of the Lecompton bill, it is plain that nothing short of the protection of slavery in all, or possibly half, of the territorial area through a slave code enacted by congress could have prevented secession. Had Douglas been willing to accept this demand and able to carry a sufficient number of northern voters with him in support of it, there would have occurred no war between the sections, and economic forces working against slavery might have continued to operate until the institution was overthrown. Surely there was no other possibility for such an outcome. This being the situation, the responsibility and credit for the civil war belongs as much to Douglas and his following as to the republican leaders and their following.

The famous "Appeal of the independent democrats" of January, 1854, which met with such a wide and vigorous response, was an extravagant and highly emotional document. The prophecies included were unsound, and the bitter charges made were unfair. The only respect to which the address is entitled is due to the intense moral earnestness of the signers. The just wrath of the champion of the principle of popular sovereignty was aroused. The most fundamental charge, that of betrayal, can stand only if the compromise of 1820 was really a sacred compact. On this issue the opponents of the repeal of the compromise occupied weak ground, because antislavery men had fought not only the Missouri compromise but all compromises involving concessions to slavery. Seward had never believed that the north was justified in agreeing to the line of 36° 30'.³ Chase

² *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, pp. 278-279; Allen Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas: a study in American politics* (New York, 1908), chapter 11.

³ In explaining his position, Seward said: "I find the honorable Senator from

held that the Missouri compromise was a sacred compact, but denied emphatically that the compromise of 1850 was a compact at all.⁴ It was possible for Douglas to prove that the antislav-

Illinois [Douglas] is standing upon the ground upon which I stood in 1850. I have nothing to say now in favor of that ground. On this occasion, I stand upon the ground, in regard to compromises, which has been adopted by the country. Then when the Senator tells me that the North did not altogether, willingly, and unanimously consent to the Compromise of 1821, I agree to it; but I have been overborne by the country . . . carried by a vote, which has been held by the South, and by the honorable Senator from Illinois to bind the North. The South, having received their consideration and equivalent, I only hold him on his own doctrine and the doctrine of the South bound to stand by it." *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, appendix, p. 329.

⁴Chase, without seeming to realize it, really stood for the right of any man to decide for himself whether a compromise was a compact or not. Under the circumstances, he was hardly the man to write, in the "Appeal of the independent democrats," the words: "We arraign this bill as a gross violation of a sacred pledge; as a criminal betrayal of precious rights." In answer to questions of Senator Dixon of Kentucky, Chase said: "I say to him distinctly that I regard the act for the admission of Missouri as a compact, binding upon the parties who were concerned in the making of it, and those parties I have already stated to be the North and the South. Then, in regard to his second interrogatory, 'were the compromises of 1850 a compact?', I say no; they were not a compact." *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, appendix, p. 284.

Chase tried to apologize somewhat for the charge relating to the presidency contained in the note appended to the "Appeal of the independent democrats." Concerning this he said: "The exact statement in the Address was this—it was a question addressed to the people: 'Would they allow their dearest rights to be made the hazards of a Presidential game?' That was the exact expression. Now, sir, it is well known that all these great measures in the country are influenced more or less by reference to the great public canvasses which are going on from time to time. I certainly did not impute to the Senator,—and I always desire to do justice,—in that any improper motive, I do not think it is an unworthy ambition to desire to be President of the United States. I do not think that the bringing forward of a measure with reference to that object would be an improper thing, if the measure be proper in itself. I differ from the Senator in my judgment on this measure. I do not think the measure is a right one. In that I express the judgment which I honestly entertain. I do not condemn his judgment. I do not make and I do not desire any personal imputations upon him in reference to a great public question."

To this apology Douglas promptly replied. "I wish to examine," he said the explanation of the Senator from Ohio, and see whether I ought to accept it satisfactory. He has quoted the language of the address. It is undeniable that that language clearly imputed to me the design of bringing forward this bill with a view of securing my own election to the presidency. Then by way of excusing himself for imputing to me such a purpose, the Senator says that he does not impugn my motives. I must remind him that in addition to that insinuation, he only said in the same address that my bill was 'a criminal betrayal of precious rights'; he only said it was 'an atrocious plot against freedom and humanity'; he only said that

ery element in and out of congress had several times shown hostility to the Missouri compromise, while admitting that he himself had several times stood by it.⁵

During the debate in the senate, Chase had attempted to insert in the bill a specific provision stating in so many words that "the people of the Territory through their representatives, may if they see fit, prohibit the existence of slavery therein." Senator Pratt of Maryland immediately proposed to amend the provision of Chase by adding the words "or introduce" after the

it was 'meditated bad faith'; he only spoke significantly of 'servile demagogues'; he only called upon preachers of the Gospel and the people at their places of meetings to denounce and resist such a monstrous iniquity. In saying all this and much more of the same sort, he now assures me in the presence of the Senate, that he did mean the charge to imply an 'unworthy ambition'; that it was not intended as a personal imputation upon my motives or character—and that he meant 'no personal disrespect' to me as the author of the measure. In reply I will only content myself with the remark that there is a very wide difference of opinion between the Senator from Ohio and myself in respect to the meaning of words, and especially in regard to the line of conduct, which in a public man, does not constitute an unworthy ambition." *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, appendix, p. 336. March 3, 1854.

⁵ In this connection, Douglas showed that New York had never accepted the Missouri compromise, and Seward admitted that for thirty years his state had refused to sanction any measure by which a concession should be made for the extension of slavery in territories not within the original bounds of the United States. That which most disconcerted the enemies of the repeal of the Missouri compromise was a house resolution of February 12, 1821, which Douglas produced. This had been introduced by Representative Rollin C. Mallory, of Vermont, during the exciting contest which was ended by the second Missouri compromise. This resolution sought, in defiance of the compromise of 1820, to prevent the admission of Missouri until her people should frame a new constitution providing that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever be allowed in the State of Missouri," with an added clause that slaves already in Missouri should not be affected. The house vote on this resolution stood 61 for, to 107 against. All of the 61 voting for the resolution were northern members. Of the 107 voting against, 33 were northern members. Thus, in the house, as Douglas pointed out, the northern members by almost two to one did not regard the act of 1820 as a compact. Having presented this very effective information, Douglas expressed himself as follows for the benefit of the signers of the "Appeal": "If this was a compact, what must have been thought of those who violated it almost immediately after it was formed? I say it is a calumny upon the North to say that it was a compact. I should feel a flush of shame, as a Northern man, if I were to say that it was a compact, and that the section of the country to which I belong received the consideration, and then repudiated the obligation eleven months after it was entered into. I deny that it was a compact in any sense of the term." *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, appendix, p. 329. See *Annals of congress*, 16 congress, 2 session, pp. 1094 and 1114, for the Mallory resolution and the vote thereon.

word "prohibit."⁶ Chase and his group would give no consideration to this proposal, and Douglas did not take up either suggestion, so that only the familiar language of his own amendment, that it was the "true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States," was included in the measure. Chase correctly prophesied that there would arise two interpretations of the language of the bill, and he wished to make certain that the phrase "subject only to the Constitution of the United States" should not in the future be interpreted to mean that the inhabitants of a territory could not prohibit slavery during the territorial period.⁷ It would have been safe for Chase to accept the provision of Senator Pratt, and Douglas would have been wise had he become at once the champion of both proposals. Chase lost a chance to make the bill more clear on his side by refusing to recognize the justice of making it more clear on both sides, and his attitude convinced the friends of the bill that his purpose was merely to obstruct. Douglas felt that the bill was sufficiently clear under his own amendment, but he discovered his mistake when he was later confronted with a southern interpretation that denied the right of the people of Kansas territory to prohibit slavery prior to admission to the union.

That the policy of popular sovereignty was a failure is open to question. That it bred a great struggle over Kansas, only a part of which was confined to that territory, is very true. That Kansas became a free state under the operation of the principle is also true. Furthermore, no one can point to a territory remaining at that time which would not have become a free state under a continued application of the principle, or in which there was any likelihood of a struggle even approaching in intensity that which had occurred in Kansas. The principle of Douglas had been tested as it would never have been tested again, and if it must be judged a failure because of the struggle it produced

⁶ *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, p. 421.

⁷ *Ibid.*

in and over Kansas, what judgment must be passed on the Wilmot proviso principle, considering the fact that the triumph of the party advocating this principle was promptly followed by secession, and that in turn by the civil war?

Is it not time to revise the common judgment of the conflicting principles held by Douglas and by the republican party? Under the conditions of climate and soil prevailing in all the territories, and in view of the superior colonizing power of the north over the south after 1850, the popular sovereignty principle was just as certain to make a free state of every territory, as the Wilmot proviso principle would have been if adopted and applied.⁸ This made no difference in the championship of the principle by Douglas, and the south was entirely correct in classing him and his supporters as almost as dangerous to the interests of that section as was the republican party.

When Douglas argued in 1854 that to turn the question of the further extension of slavery over to the people of the territories would annul the sectional conflict, he did not foresee the contest which resulted; and yet he urged his solution because he feared that a more extreme solution coming from either the north or the south would lead to disunion. There was "an irrepressible conflict," and the country was a "house divided against itself," as Seward and Lincoln were to assert four years later. Though these statesmen were then so much nearer to the armed conflict, did they, in 1858, expect a civil war to come in the near future? They recognized and asserted the fundamental and enduring nature of the conflict between the institutions of the north and those of the south, but did either of them foresee the civil war, or did either of them recognize as clearly as did Douglas the danger of disunion?⁹

The Kansas struggle followed the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act, and the civil war the triumph of the republican party, because, under the existing conditions, the stage of Amer-

⁸ See William O. Lynch, "Popular sovereignty and the colonization of Kansas from 1854 to 1860," in Mississippi valley historical association, *PROCEEDINGS*, 1917-1918, pp. 380-392.

⁹ The question here involved might be put thus: Were not the republican leaders, without knowing it, advocating a policy that was leading straight to war? Can a consistent critic condemn Douglas for lack of foresight without also condemning the great republican leaders for a greater lack?

ican civilization being what it was, and the temper of the two sections being adapted to no other solutions, these conflicts were inevitable. Have we not both blamed and praised men and parties too much, as if they were in control of forces that really controlled them?

The system of slavery was a vast thing, and the problems pertaining to it were very great. It was impossible for the people of the south to look at them with the same eyes as did the people of the north. The situation developed extremists, and those of either section used no scientific methods of gathering facts about the other. The antislavery element, by 1854, was not only opposed to anything savoring of concession to the south, but was determined to restrict the spread of slavery at every opportunity. The American system of government was also a vast thing, and regarded as the greatest undertaking of history by its ardent supporters. Its structure and principles were new enough in the world to inspire and ennoble men who contemplated them. To the strong leaders who were most deeply impressed with the grandeur of the American edifice, the sectional issue seemed a mighty menace. Leaders like Clay, Webster, and Douglas were led to fear this menace so much that they were prone to try to conciliate the south and cry down the northern extremists. To those leaders whose souls were stirred mainly by the crusade against slavery, men who made concessions to that institution appeared to be moral weaklings.

Lincoln occupied a position somewhere between that of Douglas on the one hand and that of Chase and Sumner on the other, which made it difficult for eastern antislavery leaders to understand and appreciate him.¹⁰ Douglas understood him better, and though long political rivals, the most fundamental fact about Lincoln and Douglas is that their paths converged. They not only stood side by side after the firing on Fort Sumter, but they had been approaching each other for several years.

The joint debates of 1858 did not reveal them as men who were poles apart, but, on the contrary, they were brought nearer to each other during that memorable canvass. Douglas talked about this being a white man's country and Lincoln about all

¹⁰ The reference here is not to the Garrisonian abolitionists only, but also to less extreme advocates of emancipation who found a home in the republican party.

men being created equal, but Douglas declared for the existing status of the negro in Illinois,¹¹ and Lincoln said that he was not in favor of "making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office," adding that there was "a physical difference between the white and black races" which he believed would "forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."¹² It was not possible for Lincoln to prove that Douglas was a dangerous pro-southernor, but he was able to increase the existing hostility of the south towards him. Lincoln did not accept for a moment the position of an extreme antislavery man which Douglas tried to assign to him. Both stood for the protection of slavery in the states where it already existed. Lincoln stood for the prohibition of slavery in the territories by congressional enactment, while Douglas stood staunchly by the principle of popular sovereignty, which it was clear would make free soil not only of Kansas, but in time of every other federal territory. Both were deeply hostile to the Dred Scott decision, notwithstanding the oft repeated declarations of Douglas to the contrary.

In 1860, Lincoln was the candidate of a sectional party, that stood for the application of the Wilmot proviso principle to all the territories, but he was fundamentally a union-saver, as rapidly approaching events were to prove. In 1860, Douglas was also a sectional candidate, receiving few more votes in the south as a whole than Lincoln, and he was first and last a union-

¹¹ In the debate at Alton, Douglas said: "I hold that this government was established on the white basis. It was established by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men and none others. But it does not follow, by any means, that merely because the negro is not a citizen, that therefore he should be a slave. On the contrary, it does follow that we ought to extend to the negro race, and to all other dependent races, all the rights, all the privileges, and all the immunities which they can exercise consistently with the safety of society. Humanity requires that we should give them all those privileges. Christianity commands that we should extend those privileges to them. The question then arises, what are those privileges, and what is the nature and extent of them? My answer is that that is a question which each State must answer for itself. We in Illinois have decided it for ourselves. We tried slavery, kept it up for twelve years, and finding that it was not profitable, we abolished it for that reason and became a free State. We adopted in its stead the policy that a negro in this State shall not be a slave and shall not be a citizen. We have a right to adopt that policy. For my part, I think it is a wise and sound policy for us."

¹² See the early portion of Lincoln's opening speech in the debate at Charleston for his clearest statement regarding free negroes.

saver. The division of the democratic party has almost as much moral and political significance as the origin and rise of the republican party, and is further evidence that the elemental forces of the time were bringing the two great leaders nearer together.

It has been a very common view that Douglas was throughout his career an inconsistent and shifty politician. It has been easy to express this as a mere matter of opinion, but it has been difficult to produce positive evidence to prove it. In the matter of applying the principle of the legislation of 1850 to the Nebraska country, Douglas may have been influenced somewhat by other motives, but there is no good reason for doubting that he sincerely believed that this method of dealing with slavery in the territories was the best that could be applied.¹³ In 1850, he had said: "If left to myself to carry out my own opinions, I would leave the whole subject to the people of the Territories themselves, and allow them to introduce or to exclude slavery as they may see proper. I believe that is the principle on which our institutions rest."¹⁴ It ought not to be very astonishing to anyone that the senator who thus spoke in 1850 should have been ready to apply this principle in 1854.

To antislavery men, Douglas seemed to be without conscience regarding the evil of slavery, because he stated so bluntly that he "did not care whether slavery was voted up or down." Yet this was merely a strong way of asserting his faith in the prin-

¹³ At the close of his argument for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, made on March 3, 1854, just before it was voted on in the senate, he said: "The people of the North are attached to the principle of self-government, and you can not convince them that that is self-government which deprives a people of the right of legislating for themselves, and compels them to receive laws which are forced upon them by a Legislature [congress] in which they are not represented. We are willing to stand upon this great principle of self-government everywhere; and it is to us a proud reflection that in this whole discussion, no friend of the bill has urged an argument in its favor which could not be used with the same propriety in a free State as in a slave State and *vice versa*. No enemy of the bill has used an argument which would bear repetition one mile across Mason and Dixon's line. Our opponents have dealt entirely in sectional appeals. The friends of the bill have discussed a great principle of universal application, which can be sustained by the same reasons and the same arguments in every time and in every corner of the Union." *Congressional globe*, 33 congress, 1 session, appendix, p. 338.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 31 congress, 1 session, p. 1116. June 3, 1850. It was following the remarks containing the passage quoted that Senator King of Alabama declared that Douglas had made a free soil speech. *Ibid.*, 1117.

ciple of popular sovereignty. Legally, he could mean nothing else but this by that principle. Legally, Lincoln and the republican party held strictly to the right of the states to maintain or prohibit slavery under the constitution, that is, "to vote it up or down." Douglas would extend the principle to the territories as well as to the states. The extreme antislavery men found it just as hard to approve Lincoln's attitude toward slavery in the states where it already existed, as did he and his followers to approve the position of Douglas that he "did not care whether slavery was voted up or down" in the territories.

The sincerity and consistency of Douglas in support of his principle was most strikingly shown in his fight against the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution. It was plain by 1857, that the people of Kansas in a fair election would vote against slavery by a large majority. Without a fair election to determine the fate of the Lecompton proslavery constitution, popular sovereignty would be but a mockery. That slavery would be voted down had nothing to do with the fair application of that principle. The only thing that counted in connection with the issue of popular sovereignty was that the will of the majority of the voters should be clearly expressed. Because he was honestly trying to secure a fair application of his principle, Douglas fought the Lecompton bill and voted against the English compromise. Chase, at the time governor of Ohio, stated the case very clearly in a letter of May 12, 1858, in which he said: "That Douglas acted boldly, decidedly, effectively, I agree; . . . that he has acted in consistency with his own principle of majority-sovereignty, I also freely admit. For his resistance to the Lecompton bill as a gross violation of his principle, and to the English bill for the same reason, he has my earnest thanks."¹⁵ This tribute is especially interesting and valuable, because it is not praise for the service which Douglas had rendered to the antislavery cause, but a clear recognition of his devotion to a principle long advocated.

The majority opinion in the Dred Scott case cut the ground from under the republican party. If accepted, it left no opportunity for the prohibition of slavery in the territories by congressional enactment. This and the fact that the republican

¹⁵ Chase to James S. Pike, May 12, 1858, quoted in James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850* (New York, 1895-1920), 2: 307.

party prided itself on its nationalism tempted Douglas into stating boldly and often that he did not repudiate decisions of the highest court in the land as did Lincoln and other republican leaders. He had a technical basis for this position in that the court had not defined the rights of a territorial legislature, though it had denied the right of congress to prohibit slavery in a territory. It was impossible to argue that the court in a future decision would not deny to a territorial legislature a right denied to congress, should the occasion for such a decision arise, and Douglas made no such argument. Instead, he contended with sound logic that slavery could not exist in the presence of "unfriendly legislation" by a territorial legislature, nor could it exist without "police regulations," which a hostile territorial legislature could refrain from providing. This "Freeport doctrine" squared with the facts, and it is not for this that Douglas should be condemned, but because he criticised Lincoln and other republicans for taking issue with the opinion of the court, and heralded as a great virtue the support which he was giving to its decision.

The south did not ridicule or underestimate the truth of the Freeport doctrine, as did the northern opponents of Douglas, and as many historians have done since. On the contrary, southern leaders asserted the very same points that Douglas made at Freeport both earlier and later. In reply to a speech of Senator Albert G. Brown of Mississippi, Douglas was able to repeat his Freeport doctrine by quoting passages from the speech of his antagonist.¹⁶ This was on the floor of the senate on February 23, 1859, and it was a proud moment for Douglas, because it was the best vindication of his doctrine that could be furnished, aside from an actual test in a territory. Brown had warned the senate that his state would demand positive legisla-

¹⁶ Senator Brown said in the remarks from which Douglas quoted: "I have already said that the Constitution unaided by legislation, gives us the right to protection, but it does not give us the protection itself. It does not give us the power to punish those who trespass on our property. It does not give us the power to vindicate it in any manner, shape or form. It gives us rights but they are naked rights; and until they are supported by legislation they amount to nothing but naked rights. Non-action goes a great way to exclude slave property from a Territory — further, perhaps, than to exclude any other species of property; and yet it is true that no property can exist without laws to support it. The Constitution may give the right but the law must give the remedy." *Congressional globe*, 35 congress, 1 session, p. 1243.

tion from congress, in accordance with the principles laid down by the great justices of the supreme court, should the legislature of Kansas pass laws unfriendly to slavery or fail to provide the necessary police regulations.

In the debate which took place on this occasion with Senators Brown, Jefferson Davis, and others, Douglas agreed that under the Dred Scott decision, "the owner of a slave has the same right to emigrate to a Territory, and carry his slave property with him as the owner of any other species of property has to move there, and carry his property with him." Having stated this much, he went on to say: "The Territorial legislature has the same power to legislate in respect to slaves that it has in regard to any other property, to the same extent and no further. If the Senator wishes to know what power it has over slaves in the Territories, I answer, let him tell me what power it has to legislate over every other species of property, either by encouragement or by taxation, or in any other mode, and he has my answer in regard to slave property. But the Senator says that there is something peculiar in slave property, requiring further protection than other species of property. If so it is the misfortune of those who own that species of property."¹⁷

When Senator Brown gave warning that he would demand congressional protection for slavery in Kansas territory if denied by the territorial legislature, he asked the northern democratic senators, other than Douglas, to say what they would do about it. In commenting on this demand Douglas said: "He desires to know of all other Northern Democrats what they will do; he does not wish an answer from me. I am much obliged to him for taking it for granted, from my past record, that I would never vote for a slave code in the Territories by Congress; and I have yet to learn that there is a man in a free state of this Union of any party who would."¹⁸ In this debate, we have a more clear statement of the Freeport doctrine than in the

¹⁷ *Congressional globe*, 35 congress, 1 session, p. 1244. For a valuable paper on "Stephen A. Douglas and the split in the democratic party," in which much use is made of this debate of February 23, 1859, between Senators Douglas and Brown, see O. M. Dickerson in Mississippi valley historical association, PROCEEDINGS, 1913-1914, pp. 196-211.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1244.

speeches of 1858,¹⁹ and also a clear indication of the extent of the divergence between Douglas and the south.

There was to be no reconciliation, but a division between the northern and southern democrats in 1860. The effort of Douglas to check the secession movement during the last weeks of the campaign, the election of Lincoln, the failure to compromise, the formation of the confederacy, — these are matters too familiar for comment in this paper. It was the firing on Fort Sumter and its surrender, that finally brought the converging paths of President Lincoln and his defeated rival to the meeting point. The necessity of saving the union by war taught them how superficial were their differences and how fundamental was their agreement. Their coöperation during the remaining weeks of the life of Douglas was one of the finest and most inspiring things in the history of our nation.²⁰

Though he was skilled in the use of the arts of the politician, and though he had his share of human frailties, Stephen A. Douglas was a leader who was fundamentally honest, who was possessed of a fine courage, and who could stand by a principle in which he believed in foul weather as in fair. He was enthusiastic, brilliant, and generous. He was capable of growth, and died at a time when he was giving all the thought and energy of which he was capable to the union which he loved. His death was a calamity to the country, and a sore loss to the great man in the White House, who had the confidence of the stricken leader, but who still had to win the confidence of the people.

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON

¹⁹ The Freeport doctrine was not originated in response to Lincoln's famous question, but had been clearly stated by Douglas in an earlier speech of the same campaign made prior to the first of the joint debates. It was the logic of the situation created by the Dred Scott decision that framed the question and that caused Douglas to answer it. Lincoln recognized the deep importance of the question and pressed it upon Douglas in order that the answer might be emphasized by repetition. It is not so much the difference between what was said by Senators Douglas and Brown in the debate in the senate and what had been said by them and others elsewhere that is of importance, but rather that here they were face to face. There was no chance for them to misunderstand each other. They knew that the cleavage was deep and that there would be little chance to bridge it over.

²⁰ See the splendid chapter in Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas* — chapter 20, "The summons."

OHIO'S GERMAN-LANGUAGE PRESS IN THE CAMPAIGN OF 1920

The great war and its settlement was responsible, either directly or indirectly, for nearly all the issues which divided the political parties in the presidential campaign of 1920, and the German-American was not the only racial group in our complex population which eagerly awaited the election to settle old scores with the Wilson régime. With the rapid disappearance of that rather hysterical opposition to all things German which had made their continued existence a matter of serious doubt in the days of the war, Ohio's German-language newspapers resumed, soon after the armistice, their discussions of the causes of the war and the terms of its settlement, and by the fall of 1920 practically all reasons for repressing the frank editorial discussion of American and world policies had of course disappeared.¹ The publication of the treaty of Versailles had been a bitter disillusionment for most German-American editors, for their faith in President Wilson's ability to force the adoption of a just and lasting peace had been most implicit.² The campaign of 1920 gave them their first opportunity to pass judgment upon the president's work; and Ohio's German press, and one is tempted to say that of the nation,³ was unanimous in its condemnation of Wilsonism and all it implied.

During the presidential primaries, Ohio's German press began to manifest this uncompromising, bitter hostility toward President Wilson's conduct and settlement of the war, and much of

¹ See the paper by the present writer on "Ohio's German-language press and the war," in *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly*, 28: 82-96.

² See Carl Wittke, "Ohio's German-language press and the peace negotiations," *ibid.*, 29: 49-79.

³ Frequent quotations from the leading German papers outside of Ohio lead one to hazard this conclusion. See for example, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, October 14, 23, 27, 1920, for extracts from the *Detroit Abendpost*, *New Yorker Staatszeitung*, *St. Louis Westliche Post*, *Milwaukee Herald*. The editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* comments on this unanimity, October 30, 1920.

the old anti-British and anti-French feeling, which the war period had made it inexpedient to express, made its reappearance on the editorial page.⁴ There was some argument to prove that even unrestricted submarine warfare not only was justified, but would probably be used by France and England in the next war, and the editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* was bold enough to say — what he may have thought but did not express during the war — that we entered the war simply to protect American capitalists and industrial leaders, and the heavy sale of war material to the allies during our period of neutrality.⁵

Hiram Johnson seems to have been the choice of the majority of the German newspapers for the republican nomination, mostly because of his opposition to the treaty of Versailles and the league covenant, but in part also because of his progressive record.⁶ Herbert Hoover was represented as too pro-British, and Leonard Wood as an utter impossibility.⁷ There was some fear

⁴ See for example, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, September 16, 1920. In the issue of July 2, 1920, the editor of the *Akron Germania* writes: "In two days we celebrate again our declaration of independence from England. How the times have changed!" A cartoon in the same paper for June 7, 1920, represents Uncle Sam and John Bull in bed together. John has all the covers, labeled "world trade, foreign concessions, colonies, American loans," and so forth, and is just pulling away the pillow, marked "merchant marine." Uncle Sam is about to remonstrate, when John comforts him as follows: "Never mind, Sam — fix your mind on the league of nations, and you'll soon go to sleep. Wilson says it's the 'ope of the world." The *Wächter und Anzeiger*, a Cleveland paper, on June 5, 1920, discusses the alleged atrocities committed by the negro troops of France along the Rhine; and on June 7 comments upon French oppression of the German element in Alsace. The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* ironically speculates on the possible repudiation of the French debt to America (July 7) and the *Siebenbürger-Amerikanisches Volksblatt* (Cleveland) observes: "France has also joined the ranks of the protectors of small nations. She has declared war on Syria." (July 29, 1920) The editor of the *Toledo Express* (April 29, 1920) says frankly that French friendship for the United States exists only in the language of diplomacy.

⁵ *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, September 5, 7, 1920. An extract from the French *Revue Militaire* is used to substantiate the statement concerning submarine warfare.

⁶ After a speech by Johnson in Cleveland, the *Wächter und Anzeiger*, June 3, 1920, wishes him good luck in his presidential campaign, chiefly because he stands for unadulterated Americanism, opposes article ten of the league covenant, "the straight-jacket of the world," and is the foe of reaction. When Johnson lost the nomination, the *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 14, 1920, accounted for his defeat by explaining the generally prevalent fear of radicalism, and also blaming the support Johnson received from the Hearst newspapers.

⁷ See for example two cartoons in the *Akron Germania* of June 4, 1920. The

lest the republican convention should fall under the control of the reactionary old guard.⁸ But however sincere this pre-convention interest in progressivism may have been, it disappeared almost immediately after Mr. Harding's nomination. The *Toledo Express* endorsed the selection, because the candidate would be a "constitutional president, and not a despot"; and the *Akron Germania* described the senator as an unbossed statesman, of iron will, honest heart, and real American principles. The editor of the *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* was satisfied because Mr. Harding, during the war period, had protested against the persecution of the German element in America. When the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* learned that Harding's nomination had been opposed by the pro-British press and the capitalist class, the wisdom of the republican convention in selecting this candidate was no longer questioned. Opposition from such sources was accepted as absolute proof of the candidate's unadulterated Americanism.⁹

Immediately after the nomination, the vehement denunciation *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, June 17, 1920, speaks of Mr. Hoover as "'Erbert 'Oover aus Lunden.'" See also *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 2, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, June 1, 1920. In an editorial paragraph, the editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, July 7, 1920, caustically observes: "In Chicago, fifteen tons of Wood campaign literature was recently sold to a junk dealer for \$650. Some say that was still too much." The editor of the *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* urged German-Americans to remember that during the war both the democrats and the republicans had attacked them and questioned their loyalty.

⁸ *Ibid.*, June 16, 1920. The *Akron Germania*, June 16, believes a republican victory depends upon a campaign conducted along progressive lines. For the same view, see also *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 6, 1920. The *Wächter und Anzeiger* of June 14 speaks of Harding and Coolidge as old-school conservatives; the same paper, July 16, 1920, looks with favor upon the organization of the farmer-labor party, and believes it will act as the leaven for the other parties.

⁹ *Toledo Express*, June 17, 1920: "Sing a *Te Deum* that we have been saved from Wood." See also *Akron Germania*, and *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* for June 14, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 16, 1920. Perhaps the editorial in the *Toledo Express* for July 15 comes very near giving expression to the real sentiments of the German-American newspaper men. The editor points out that there is much in the republican party of which the German-Americans cannot approve. But the issue is to kill Wilsonism and to get revenge for the treatment received at the hands of the Wilson administration. Hiram Johnson, the editor continues, was our real choice, but it is fortunate that he did not try to form a third party. The German-Americans alone are too weak, and the republican party is too weak without us, but with perfect coöperation, it will be possible to give Wilson the death-blow.

of Mr. Wilson's administration began. The president was represented as a despot who had abandoned all constitutional restrictions. Much space was devoted to a discussion of the heavy expenditures and the alleged waste and extravagance of the democratic administration. But naturally the main attack was directed against the president's foreign policy and the peace of Versailles, which was generally represented as a gross betrayal of the German nation. The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* dwelt particularly upon the oppressed population of the Saar basin, Tyrol, Austria, and Danzig.¹⁰ The *Akron Columbia* rather wittily observed that the democratic platform was just like the peace treaty in one respect, because it did not mention the fourteen points.¹¹ The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* argues that we entered the war to make the world safe for democracy, to secure the freedom of the seas, to make a just and lasting peace, and to guarantee the right of self-determination to all peoples, and then surrendered all our principles at the peace conference. The report that Mr. Wilson, while still governor of New Jersey, had expressed the wish to close his life upon an English estate was enough to furnish the inspiration for a long article to prove that the president was an Anglophile of the worst variety.¹²

¹⁰ *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, June 2, *Toledo Express*, August 5, 26, 1920. This paper, on August 5, contains a curious paragraph to the effect that any voter can make up his mind in regard to a party which, in a political crisis for which it itself was responsible, spent \$36,818,000,000 in four years, while in 129 years from 1789 to 1917 the total federal expenditures had been only \$30,000,000,000.

The *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, October 31, 1920, contains an article on "The despot of the White House"; the *Wächter und Anzeiger* of June 8 reported Senator Lodge's opening speech at the Chicago convention under the headlines, "Dynasty of Wilson under fire"; a cartoon in the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* of June 2 shows Uncle Sam dusting the cobwebs from the United States constitution.

¹¹ July 16, 1920. On July 14, the *Akron Germania* became the *Akron Columbia*. In explaining the change of name, the editor says in part:

"We are not ashamed of our old name, and even during the stormy period of the war, when so many of our misguided fellow-citizens, either from hysterical patriotism, or from motives less honorable, denounced and slandered everything of German origin, we proudly sailed under our old and glorious flag of *Akron Germania* . . . [We have] chosen the name of *Columbia* in order to signify that American ideas and ideals are first and foremost in our hearts, as they always have been." The aim of the paper is declared to be to produce "an American newspaper in the German language, to be a valuable and indispensable medium of Americanization in everything good and honest and commendable the word implies."

¹² *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, August 1, September 23, 1920. The issue of this paper

The Wilson plan for a league of nations was of course uncompromisingly rejected, and most of the stock arguments that appeared in English dailies were repeated by the German press of Ohio. But the league seemed particularly obnoxious to the German newspapers because to them it appeared to be especially designed to protect British and French interests. The *Wächter und Anzeiger* calls it a league in the interest of British and French imperialism, and international capital. The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* believes it will give the British control of the world forever and will furnish American cannon-fodder for the British empire.¹³

Not only was the German-language press of Ohio unanimously opposed to the candidacy of Governor Cox, but it seemed fully conscious of the political power the German element could exercise in the coming election. The *Akron Columbia*, hitherto an independent democratic paper, urged all German-Americans to go to the polls to teach the politicians that they must henceforth seriously reckon with the voters of German stock. The *Toledo* for October 5 quotes Mayor Thompson of Chicago as follows: "What can the American people expect from a political party that promised peace in 1916, led it into war in 1917, and has since kept it in war, although fighting ceased two years ago?" In the issue of September 19 the editor insists that the German-American vote in 1920 will be republican, because the democratic party in 1916 deceived us by the slogan "He kept us out of war," not because the United States declared war on Germany. Further, the democratic administration is charged with extravagance, autocracy, interference with constitutional rights, and needless and groundless distrust of American citizens of German extraction.

¹³ October 22, 1920. This issue also interprets article ten as a surrender of American sovereignty. See also the issue of July 23, and *Wächter und Anzeiger*, August 20, 1920. There is much discussion of the Monroe doctrine and the traditional American policy of isolation. See *ibid.*, August 17, 18, *Toledo Express*, June 24, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, October 5, 15, 1920. *Ibid.*, August 25, 1920, condemns the league because it is the means of condemning 15,000,000 German brothers to death. In the course of the discussion, the *New York Times* and the *New York Evening Post* are spoken of as British organs, because of their approval of the league. *Ibid.*, October 3, 1920. A cartoon, *ibid.*, October 7, 1920, shows wounded American soldiers disembarking at an American port. John Bull is calling to Uncle Sam, "Hi—Sam! Send me over a new army." Above the cartoon are the words, "If we were in the league of nations." The *Akron Columbia*, October 8, 1920, believes that the league was designed simply to get the United States to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the other nations. The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* of August 9, 1920, headlines Governor Cox's acceptance speech, in which he advocated joining the league, with "Wants to remain the slave of the allies."

Express regarded it as the patriotic duty of the German press to speak out unafraid in the campaign, and reminded the German-Americans that this time they were "the index of the scale."¹⁴

The reasons for this united opposition to the democratic candidate fall into two classes. First, there was the desire to rebuke President Wilson and his administration. The argument of the *Wächter und Anzeiger* is typical on this point. "No German-American can vote for Cox . . . Cox is Wilson . . . He has a millstone 'round his neck—Wilson's league of nations."¹⁵ The German-American wants freedom, the right to use the German language, immediate peace with Germany, and the rejection of the league. Therefore, he must be for Harding. Of equal importance in influencing the voters of German stock against Governor Cox was the latter's alleged insulting attitude toward the German element of Ohio during the war period. The German-Americans protested that their patriotism had been questioned, and their natural love for the mother tongue made the basis for the most slanderous charges of disloyalty. Governor Cox's message of April 1, 1919, to the Ohio legislature, in which he charged the presence of German propaganda in the Ohio schools, and used his influence to end the teaching of German, was quoted again and again as proof of the democratic candidate's unfriendly attitude. The German voter was urged to give the governor the proper receipt for these slanders on election day.¹⁶ The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* considered this message as the first reason for the solid anti-Cox sentiment among the German element.¹⁷ An appeal signed by the editors of the

¹⁴ "Das Zünglein an der Wage." *Toledo Express*, June 10, July 29, 1920. See *Akron Columbia*, August 6, October 20, 1920.

¹⁵ October 30, 1920. The *Toledo Express*, July 22, 1920, calls Governor Cox a chip of the Wilson block, and points out that the governor's paper, the *Dayton News*, has consistently championed the Wilson policies. *Toledo Express*, October 21, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, September 29, October 13, *Akron Columbia*, November 1, 1920.

¹⁶ *Wächter und Anzeiger*, October 23, *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, October 25, 1920. The editor of the latter paper also prints, November 1, 1920, the letter Cox had sent him when he protested against the law abolishing German in the Ohio schools. See also *Wächter und Anzeiger*, November 1, 1920, for the editorial, "Lest we forget."

¹⁷ October 26, 1920. One pointed paragraph in the *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* for August 3, 1920, comments as follows: "War governor? Yes, the proper name. He

Freie Presse and the *Wächter und Anzeiger*, and published in many other papers, summoned all German-Americans to strike at Cox through the ballot, in retaliation for his un-American attacks upon the German element. "Every vote for Harding is a protest against the persecution of Americans of German origin during the last years."¹⁸ Statements like these occur so frequently that one is tempted to believe that the motive of revenge was most responsible for the solid anti-Cox vote among the German element in 1920. Nevertheless, some of the German papers were careful to insist that their decision rested on purely American principles. The *Wächter und Anzeiger* insists that it is genuine opposition to the league, and the belief that Governor Cox is nothing more than a demagogue that accounts for the unanimity among German-Americans.¹⁹ The editor bitterly resents charges of the *New York Times* to the effect that German propaganda is at work, and points out that the German element in the United States is actually opposing the wishes of the Fatherland, for it is assumed that the German republic is anxious to gain admission to the league.²⁰

waged war on the peaceful citizens of Ohio." Also in the *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, August 18, 1920: "Cox thinks it's as easy to end the war as it was to banish German from the public schools of Ohio."

¹⁸ *Toledo Express*, October 14, *Gross Daytuner Zeitung*, October 14, 1920. The article further urges a protest vote because "Americans of German stock have had to witness the time when it was forbidden them by law to allow their children to pray to God in the language of their mothers, in the same language that has been heard in this country for generations; in the language of our kinsmen who helped win Grant's victories; in the language which it has ever been the pride of educated Americans to command, even those in whose veins there flowed no German blood." The *Wächter und Anzeiger* of July 21, 1920, quotes significant extracts from Governor Cox's 1919 message to the legislature—"The teaching of German to our children . . . is a distinct menace to Americanism," and "part of a conspiracy formed long ago by the German government in Berlin." Cox is termed a "Deutschen-fresser erster Classe." The *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, October 4, 1920, calls for vengeance against all who called the German-Americans "Huns" during the war.

¹⁹ October 16, 1920. The editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* argues that he will vote not as a German-American, but as an American protesting against the un-American attacks of Governor Cox. (Letter in the *Toledo Express*, August 26, 1920.)

²⁰ September 7, 1920. The *Toledo Express* for September 23, 1920, sums up the reasons for the solid republican vote among the German element as follows: (1) the betrayal by the democrats in 1916, under the slogan "He kept us out of war"; (2) democratic autoocracy and invasions of personal rights; (3) democratic waste, inefficiency; (4) Cox's insults to the German element.

The *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, October 18, 1920, quotes the *Milwaukee Herald* of

As the campaign progressed, the assaults upon Governor Cox became more and more vehement and personal. He was denounced as "a cheap, American politician," an opportunist, a popularity seeker, a nativist, one who has "double-crossed" the Germans of Ohio and also the wet interests from whom he formerly derived much of his support, a character so stupid that he belongs in a political children's home, instead of in the White House, and so ignorant that in the old Germany he would have failed to qualify for night watchman.²¹ His nomination was accepted as absolute proof of the bankruptcy of the democratic party, and the *Siebenbürger-Amerikanisches Volksblatt* asserts the party could not have gone lower in the scale to get a candidate.²² The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* with a clever reference to the governor's country estate near Dayton, repeatedly refers to Mr. Cox as "Sir James of Trailsend," and contrasts the millionaire's mode of life with the simple democracy which prevails at Marion. Furthermore, as one editor puts it, the democratic party is this time the party supported by big business, and Cox is the choice of Morgan and company, Wall street, the *New York Times* and the *New York Evening Post*, "the leading

October 13 in substance as follows: The German-Americans stood the test during the war, and not only made every sacrifice to be expected from any citizen, but a much greater sacrifice, "for their hearts bled when their sons stood opposed to their brothers in battle." They suffered, but remained faithful. But then came the continuation of the hunger blockade against Germany, and France's "black beasts" along the Rhine. This was too much, and now German-Americans are opposed to Wilsonism and will be solidly opposed to Cox. The *Siebenbürger-Amerikanisches Volksblatt* (Cleveland) shared these views, and (October 7) urged the German voter to make his power felt, and then naïvely showed that the German-American has never asked for as much as the Irish-American. See also *ibid.*, September 2, 1920.

²¹ *Wächter und Anzeiger*, June 28, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, August 9, September 15, *Toledo Express*, September 2, *Gross Daytuner Zeitung*, August 21, 1920.

²² July 15, 1920. See also *Gross Daytuner Zeitung*, July 8, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, July 6, 1920. The *Henry County Demokrat* (Napoleon, Ohio) on July 7, 1920, predicted that Governor Cox would lose Henry county. In this county there was some trouble with the very numerous German element during the war. The *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 28, 1920, referring to the nomination of Governor Cox, very unkindly quotes the German proverb, "In dem Schafstalle kann auch das Kalb König sein." The only German paper in Ohio to regard the nomination of Cox as a wise move was the *Akron Germania*. In its issue of July 7, 1920, it asserts that the democratic party is to be congratulated upon the nomination of such a sly political fox, and regards the selection as a blow against Wilson.

Northcliffe organs in America.”²³ A quotation from an Indiana Catholic journal was used to represent Cox as “a fervent hater of Catholics.”²⁴ Because of the campaign methods of the democratic candidate, he received the title of “the political Billy Sunday,” and when Governor Cox, because of the strain of campaigning, was forced to rest his voice for a few days, the editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* was unkind enough to observe — “The Portland [Oregon] doctor who advised Cox to save his voice, is the wisest democrat we’ve heard of for a long time.”²⁵

In vivid contrast with the personality and methods of the democratic candidate, the German papers of Ohio represented the virtues of Senator Harding. His apparent rejection of the league, his watchword, “America first,” and his declaration for an immediate peace with Germany and the prompt withdrawal of the American army of occupation from the Rhine, were enough to win the hearts of the German element. His acceptance speech reminded the editor of the *Akron Columbia* of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and the fact that it was unfavorably received in England was further proof of its excellence. The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* promised firm adherence to Harding’s motto of “America first,” and rejected the “Rule Britannia” which Cox might strike up for the benefit of his British friends. Much effort was expended to prove Harding a true and tried friend of the German-American. The *Toledo Express* discovered that Mr. Harding’s father-in-law was of German stock, spoke German fluently, had toured Germany, and had never been ashamed of his descent. The editor apparently

²³ *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, August 15, 22, September 3, 9, October 12, 1920.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, October 28, 1920, quoting an article, “A Catholic paper’s opinion of Governor Cox and the democratic party,” from the Collegeville, Indiana, *Botschafter*.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, September 20, November 4, 1920. None of the German papers of Ohio gave credence to the charges of Governor Cox concerning a republican slush fund, and they countered with the charge that the democrats were levying campaign assessments upon the office-holders. See *Wächter und Anzeiger*, August 27, 28, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, July 24, September 12, 1920. Some effort was also made to discredit Governor Cox as a progressive. See an article from *Harvey’s Weekly* on the Ohio workmen’s compensation act, reprinted in the *Wächter und Anzeiger*, October 15, 1920.

believed that these qualifications of the father-in-law had some bearing on the issues of the campaign.²⁶

Needless to say, the managers of the republican campaign took advantage of this hostility of the German element to the democrats. Some campaign literature for the guidance of German editors was issued in the German language, and during the closing weeks of the campaign, the republican national committee advertised extensively in the German papers.²⁷ The most interesting of these paid political advertisements was one headed "What the German-language press has to say about the two candidates for president." It contained quotations from the editorial pages of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, *Cleveland Wächter und Anzeiger*, *Omaha Tribune*, *Chicago Abendpost*, *Milwaukee Herold*, *New Yorker Staatszeitung*, *St. Louis Amerika*, *St. Louis Westliche Post*, *Der Wanderer* (St. Paul), and an extract from an article by former Secretary of labor Charles Nagel. Needless to say, all heartily endorsed the republican candidate.²⁸

In spite of the fact that the task seemed almost hopeless, the democratic organization seems to have made some effort also to catch the voter of German origin. The main argument was that Cox had been misrepresented, and that he would really help Germany if elected, by securing her immediate admission to the league of nations.²⁹ The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* repeat-

²⁶ *Akron Columbia*, July 23, 26, 30, 1920. See also *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, July 8, 23, September 17, October 12, November 1, *Toledo Express*, July 15, 29, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, August 30, September 30, 1920.

²⁷ See *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 12, October 26, *Toledo Express*, October 21, 28, *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, October 9, 21, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, October 21, 26, 28, *Akron Columbia*, October 29, 1920.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, October 20, 1920. Another interesting sidelight on the methods of the professional politician is gained from a report in the *Freie Presse*, September 24, 1920, of a visit of a delegation of foreign-born Americans to Marion. Senator McCormick of Illinois seems to have been master of ceremonies. Representatives of the German and Irish stock were included among the delegates, but Senator McCormick let it be understood that he believed it a mistake to include these two race elements, *because we count them this long time as pure Americans*. Assurance was given the German delegates that Harding had no intention of interfering with German in the schools. Senator McCormick, furthermore, for the purposes of the occasion, displayed a fine knowledge of German art and *Kultur*.

²⁹ *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, September 2, October 30, 1920. See also comment on a speech by Senator Owen at Greenfield, Ohio, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, September 11,

edly charged the *Dayton News* (owned by Governor Cox) with trying to lure the German voter into the democratic fold, and on the eve of the election, a public meeting was announced in Dayton, at the Liederkrantz hall, to discuss "the league of nations and its relation to the German republic." The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* did not refuse to print a paid advertisement of the meeting, but simultaneously printed a long letter denouncing the meeting as a Cox trick, arranged for by the friends of the governor, and urging every German to stay away.³⁰ The only trouble the Ohio German press seems to have encountered in its effort to line up the solid German-American vote for Harding came from an attempt to inject the wet and dry question into the campaign. One wonders whether there may not have been some secret encouragement from democratic headquarters for the propaganda among the German element that Cox would be friendly to the liberal element. The editors of the *Freie Presse* and the *Wächter und Anzeiger* report the receipt of numerous letters inquiring about Mr. Harding's attitude on prohibition, and raising the query whether the wet and dry issue is not after all the leading one of the campaign. If so, the German element would of course vote for Cox. Both papers hasten to assert that Mr. Harding's attitude on prohibition is satisfactory, that Governor Cox cannot be trusted even on this issue, and that in any case, no German-American should sell his self-respect and his convictions for four per cent beer.³¹

The republican landslide in November was the occasion for un-
Gross Daytoner Zeitung, September 13, 25; also charges in the *Wächter und Anzeiger*, September 2, 1920. The *Akron Columbia*, October 22, 1920, carried a full page advertisement paid for by the Summit county democratic committee.

³⁰ *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, September 16, October 22, 30, 1920. The *Cincinnati Freie Presse* of August 24, 1920, reports that at South Bend, Indiana, Governor Cox was presented to his audience by an American of German birth and name. Instead of feeling flattered by this political move, the editor denounces it as another insult to the German element.

³¹ *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, June 18, July 7, *Wächter und Anzeiger*, June 23, July 17, August 9, October 21, *Akron Germania*, June 23, *Gross Daytoner Zeitung*, September 13, October 13, 1920. The *Toledo Express* of July 8 says the German-Americans will not be lured by a wet, beer plank in the democratic platform. "Rather prohibition than the continuation of the despicable democratic régime which has treated us Germans like dogs, and has represented us to the whole American nation as the scum of humanity."

restrained rejoicing in the columns of the German press, coupled with not a little exultation over the share of the German-Americans in determining the outcome. "Wilsonism is forever abolished. The People have spoken. Ours is the victory"—is the headline in the *Toledo Express*. "The free people of America have crushed the snake of Wilsonism" is the version of the editor of the *Cincinnati Freie Presse*. An editorial paragraph sarcastically reports the rumor that Governor Cox is to receive consolation for his defeat in the form of a high British decoration.³²

The *Wächter und Anzeiger* boldly claimed the credit for Mr. Harding's triumph for the American men and women of Irish and German blood. Furthermore, the election result seems to have had a marked effect upon the slowly reviving confidence of the German-language press and its readers in their political power and importance. The *Wächter und Anzeiger* believes that the election has convinced the politicians of the voting power of the German element, and reminds the republican party that it is on trial and will be held to strict accountability for the promises made during the campaign. The editor of the *Toledo Express* was the most outspoken. He made a strong plea for the revival of the German-language press, as a mouthpiece for all Americans of German origin. "Let us make it clear to the newly-elected gentleman, at the very outset," so ended the article, "that we constitute a real power, that we have a right to

³² *Ibid.*, November 3, 4, 1920. There are some signs that the German element was soon disillusioned. This is especially clear from an editorial soon after the inauguration (March 16, 1921) in the *Columbus Herald*, a German paper established in Columbus since the war. The German readers of central Ohio have been without a paper since the old *Columbus Express and Westbote* suspended during the war. The *Herald* has had some difficulties with the American legion, but now seems to be fairly well established. Two weeks after the inauguration, the editor points out that the republicans have apparently forgotten their campaign pledge to make an immediate peace with Germany, which was after all the deciding argument in inducing the German-American voters to support Harding. Furthermore, the reported selection of Mr. Herrick for the post at Paris and Colonel Harvey for the Court of St. James is particularly offensive to the German element. The editor concludes that there has been no noticeable improvement since March 4.

See also *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, November 3, 5, 1920. When it was announced that Mr. Cox was contemplating a tour of Europe, the editor observed that this was the first sensible idea for a long time. Had he known more of Europe, he would not have been "taken in" by the league.

make ourselves heard, and that we will never again allow any one to deprive us of that right with impunity."³³

CARL WITTKÉ

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS

³³ *Wächter und Anzeiger*, November 3, 4, *Cincinnati Freie Presse*, November 3, *Toledo Express*, November 25, 1920. The *Gross Daytoner Zeitung* as early as June 25, 1920, urged parents to begin the agitation to revive the teaching of German in the high schools of Ohio. A very moderate and sane editorial appeared in the *Akron Columbia* of August 20, 1920, under the heading, "The attitude of the foreign-born toward the parties." The editor deplores the attempts by both parties to exploit racial groups for their political ends, and contends that the foreign-born citizen is more apt to think for himself and more anxious to preserve a pure Americanism than the native. The democrats in 1920 incurred so many difficulties because they had stirred up bitter racial antagonisms and had made the immigrant feel that he was only being tolerated in the United States. The editor advises the republicans to abandon mere flattery, and to appeal to the real American feelings of the foreign-born in our population.

THE ATTEMPT OF NEW ORLEANS TO MEET THE CRISIS IN HER TRADE WITH THE WEST

Early in the forties the activity of eastern capital was causing an ominous note to be sounded at New Orleans. There was a strong possibility that the monopoly of the Mississippi river as a carrier of western agricultural products would be hindered not only by systematic canal development tapping the field and drawing off a goodly portion of the crops in season, but also by railroads which were advancing toward the rapidly developing west.¹ But so strongly entrenched by natural advantages did New Orleans feel at that time, that it seemed to those interested hardly probable that the current of commerce would turn upstream.

By 1850 the Ohio valley had been invaded by railroads from the east, and there were plans to build to the banks of the Mississippi river itself and turn the flow of its trade at various points without permitting it to take its natural course to the sea. Could New Orleans afford to let all this business go without a struggle to retain it? Could the city quietly wait and let these enterprises make their attempt, believing that the attempt to turn this tide of trade would prove futile? The fact is that it was already being realized that business could be turned, that some had been turned, and so more might easily follow. This was alarming. From the middle forties on to the end of the fifties the market reports and southern publications were continually touching on the subject. It was time for the commercial interests of New Orleans to bestir themselves. Over and over it was urged that steps be taken to retain that trade which by *nature* belonged to New Orleans.

But what steps were to be taken? Keel-boats and rude rafts had long ago given place to steamboats and great flatboats; the

¹ "Annual review of the commerce of New Orleans, Sept. 1, 1843," in *New Orleans Price Current, Commercial Intelligencer and Merchants' Transcript*, September 9, 1843. ✓

steamboats in turn had been improved to the maximum of carrying power for freight and of comfort for the traveler.² More commodious boats could hardly be introduced because they could not be operated in the varying conditions of navigation on the Mississippi river and its tributaries. Besides, while the river had been secure in certain advantages in the past, such as being open during the winter months, it also had the disadvantage of uncertainty. Promptness of delivery depended upon the stages of the river, and it was by no means uncommon for products to be kept back weeks and even months by reason of low water in the Mississippi and its tributaries above Memphis.³ Snags, too, were an ever present cause of loss and of high insurance rates. Both of these items were factors in increasing the cost of transportation by the river at the very time when lower transportation rates were necessary in the face of railroad competition. These things proved serious to the trading interests in New Orleans. Tonnage might be increased, and was increased, by building more steamboats, but this would not do away with such difficulties as low water and snags.⁴ Railroad competition must be met with railroads. They must be built, not to do away with steamboat freighting, but to supplement the river traffic as they supplemented lake and canal traffic in the north.

In order that New Orleans should gain that preëminence in trade coveted by her, this became her program: to build railroads to the north and west to serve as aids in collecting and distributing commodities, to enlarge the channels for exports

² See Mark Twain, *Life on the Mississippi*, *passim*.

³ The *Cincinnati Gazette*, September 1, 1854, says: "The Ohio river has not been lower than at present, we think, since 1838, when navigation was pretty much suspended. We recollect there was one day in the autumn of that year, in which there was not a steamboat visible at the Landing, either laid up or otherwise. There being no Railroads nor Canals to the Lakes, many articles of prime necessity became scarce and dear. Coffee retailed at 33 cents per pound, sugar at 25 cents, molasses \$1 per gallon, and salt \$3 to \$4 per bushel. On the first of January, 1839, it was estimated there was not a month's supply of Groceries in the city. Coffee was wagoned from Baltimore, and other places. Thanks to our Railroads and Canals, such a state of things can never again exist." See also the annual statements of the *New Orleans Price Current*, 1830-1860.

⁴ This would have been a fit time for the innovation which developed after the war — the steam tug with attached barges.

and imports by developing better shipping facilities with the eastern seaboard and with Europe, to build a railroad across the isthmus to shorten the route to California, or otherwise to seize the golden opportunity of California trade, and finally to establish manufactures of various kinds in order that some of the profit that had been going to the north and to Europe might accrue to local interests. Much space in the *New Orleans Price Current* and in *De Bow's review* was used for agitating these matters. Mr. De Bow himself was active in the various conventions where the question of railroads for the south was discussed.⁵

It was not difficult for the commercial interests of New Orleans to perceive that railroad connections extended as far north as the Ohio would be beneficial to the western trade of the city. Since the possible benefit was admitted, the fundamental question was, how to get the railroads built. Beginning in 1849 conventions were held in Mississippi and Louisiana for the purpose of deciding on feasible routes and the organization of railroad enterprise. One of these met at Monticello in December, 1849, to discuss the building of a railroad from Jackson to New Orleans. Committees were selected to carry on arrangements; the legislature of Mississippi was applied to for a charter; the legislatures of Mississippi and Louisiana were asked to memorialize congress requesting a grant of public land for aiding the enterprise; then the convention was adjourned to meet in New Orleans in March, 1850.⁶ This was the beginning of a movement for a north and south railroad from New Orleans that was destined to engage much of the railroad energy of Louisiana and Mississippi during the fifties.

The adjourned convention met at New Orleans on March 21, 1850. The committees reported that a charter had been secured from the legislature of Mississippi, and a right of way had been obtained. At this meeting a committee of three was appointed to memorialize congress for a grant of alternate sections of public lands for six miles on each side of the proposed railroad as well as for a right of way through public lands. This memor-

⁵ *New Orleans Price Current*, September 2, 1850; *De Bow's review*, old series, vol. 1 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 8: 177-178.

ial was prepared and signed by all the delegates present. It was also resolved to send an agent to Washington, if possible, "to urge the matter there." Provisions were made for surveying the three possible routes, the most practical of them to be adopted. It was supposed that since the undertaking was of great importance to people residing on or near the route, local subscriptions to stock would come in to aid the work. A public meeting of the citizens of New Orleans was to be called to recommend the incorporation of the road under the Louisiana laws.⁷

Other conventions followed in the succeeding months, and recommendations and resolutions in great numbers resulted. Gradually the problem of ways and means was approaching solution. The fundamental principle laid down was that the building of railroads was of vital importance to all citizens of the state and not merely to those engaged in commercial pursuits or resident in New Orleans. Railroads were internal improvements and should be established by the aid of towns, counties, and the state. A proposition was brought forward in the "Southwest railroad convention" meeting in New Orleans, April 16, 1851, for securing municipal and county aid.⁸

The legislature of Louisiana was appealed to, and in March, 1882, it passed an act by which the parish police juries and municipal corporations were authorized to subscribe to the stock of corporations undertaking internal improvements on complying with certain provisions. Any ordinance passed under this authorization was to contain a statement of the number and amount of shares proposed to be subscribed, provision for the levy of a sufficient tax on the landed estate in the parish or municipality to pay the subscription, and specification of the rate and period of taxation. Such ordinance was to become operative only when a majority of the voters whose property was

⁷ *De Bow's review*, old series, 8:486-488.

⁸ See the Report of the committee on ways and means, in "South-western railroad convention, New-Orleans," April 16, 1851, *ibid.*, 10: 692: "That the New-Orleans and Jackson Rail-road, being a work immediately public in its character, and calculated to promote the general prosperity of the state, and especially enhance the value of the entire property situated on the line of the route, and at its termini, justice requires that means for its construction be provided at the expense of all who are to share its benefits." Numerous conventions are all reported *ibid.*, vols. 10-13 (1851-1852).

to be taxed should ratify it at a special election. The taxpayers were to become individually owners of their stock to the amount of the tax each paid.⁹

On Monday, June 21, 1852, the question of imposing a special tax for aiding in the construction of railroads was decided favorably at a special election in New Orleans by a vote of 2,954 to 503. By this election the property holders of New Orleans imposed a tax of \$3,500,000 on themselves. Two millions were to be appropriated to aid in the construction of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern railroad, and one million and a half to the construction of the New Orleans and Opelousas railroad.¹⁰

While this arrangement made it possible to get aid from municipalities and parishes directly in touch with the enterprise, it could not secure the aid of the state as a whole. Under the existing constitution the state could not subscribe to the stock of any corporation, nor could the state pledge its faith for assisting the railroads in any way. The commercial and financial classes obtained sufficient support from the agricultural and other interests of the state to succeed in having a constitutional convention called which should so revise the fundamental laws of the state as to encourage and aid the building of railroads as internal improvements. The convention met on July 5 and completed its work on July 31, 1852. The people of the state later adopted this constitution when submitted to their vote.¹¹

⁹ Acts passed by the fourth legislature of the state of Louisiana, 1852 (New Orleans, 1852), 128.

¹⁰ New Orleans Price Current, June 26, 1852.

¹¹ In the constitution of Louisiana of 1845, article 121 reads, "The State shall not become subscriber to the stock of any corporation or joint stock company"; article 113, "The Legislature shall not pledge the faith of the State for the payment of any bonds, bills, or other contracts or obligations for the benefit or use of any person or persons, corporations, or body politic whatever."

Of the new constitution, as printed in the *Journal of the constitutional convention of Louisiana, 1852*, article 108 reads, "The State shall not subscribe for the stock of, nor make a loan to, nor pledge its faith for the benefit of any corporation or joint stock company, created or established for banking purposes, nor for other purposes than those described in the following article."

Article 109 reads: "The Legislature shall have power to grant aid to companies or associations of individuals, formed for the purpose of making works of internal improvement, wholly or partially within the State, to the extent of only one-fifth of the capital of such companies, by subscription of stock or loan of money or public bonds; but any aid thus granted shall be paid to the company only in the same proportion as

In this revision of the constitution it is easily apparent that the commercial and financial interests were acting together for mutual advantages. And, in fact, better credit and banking facilities were of equal importance with railroads to the commercial interests of New Orleans. The possible objection of the agriculturists and the owners of city property who would have the principal part in paying the taxes had been met by arguments in the newspapers and in *De Bow's review* before the convention had been called. The chief argument used on the agriculturist was that it meant better means for marketing his crops, increased avenues of trade, and increased demand for his products. For the land owner in country and city the argument was that the railroad connections meant increased value of the land. The principal opposition in the convention seems to have come from those who were favorably situated already, and from those who had little hope for an extension of the railroad building to where it would affect their communities one way or the other.¹²

The questions of banking, credit, railroads, and commerce were intimately interrelated, and the revision of the state constitution was directly in line with the progressive policy of all these interests. The constitution of 1845 by refusing to permit more banking corporations to be chartered and by gradually decreasing the number of banks continuing in business, had opened the way for practically a banking monopoly in the state. This was a check to the entrance of new capital for banks and by the same token a hindrance to credit facilities for commercial operations. It was felt that more facilities

the remainder of the capital shall be actually paid in by the stockholders of the company, and, in case of loan, such adequate security shall be required, as to the Legislature may seem proper. No corporation or individual association receiving the aid of the State, as herein provided, shall possess banking or discounting privileges."

Article 110 reads: "No liability shall be contracted by the State as above mentioned, unless the same be authorized by some law for some single object or work to be distinctly specified therein, which shall be passed by a majority of the members elected to both Houses of the General Assembly, and the aggregate amount of debts and liabilities incurred under this and the preceding article shall never, at any time, exceed eight millions of dollars."

¹² *Journal of the constitutional convention, 1852.*

should be afforded to the increasing business of New Orleans and that unnecessary restrictions on trade should be removed. Especially at the time when railroad enterprises were being planned it was of considerable importance to attract more capital into the state for application to these improvements. The new constitution made possible the reorganization of banking in the state, and the legislative acts of 1853 and 1855 established a general system of "free banking" in Louisiana.¹³ By section 12 of the act of March 15, 1855, the currency of the banks established under the act was to be based on certain securities deposited and assigned to the state auditor, namely: United States bonds, Louisiana state bonds, bonds of the consolidated debt of the city of New Orleans,¹⁴ bonds of New Orleans issued for subscription to the stock of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern railroad company under the act of March 15, 1854, and bonds of New Orleans issued by an act of the same date for subscribing to the stock of the New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western railroad company.

The above mentioned issues of New Orleans bonds for subscription to railroad stock in 1854 came about in the following way. We have seen how according to the act of the state legislature of 1852 New Orleans had levied a tax on the real estate within its limits to subscribe to the stock of certain railroads. The property owners had to bear the burden of this tax and it was liable to be quite heavy now and then. Furthermore, the railroads had to await the collection of taxes to exchange capital stock for cash. Both interested parties, therefore, began to agitate a substitute plan by which the tax would be distributed over a great number of years and yet the tax-secured bonds could

¹³ *New Orleans Price Current*, September 1, 1853, May 9, 1855; *Acts of Louisiana*, 1855, 214-244.

¹⁴ For some years previous to 1852 the city of New Orleans had been divided into three municipalities, each making its own debts as well as looking after its own governmental affairs for the most part, although there was a general board with supervision in some important governmental matters. The effect on trade and credit outside the city was not favorable and the commercial interests were injured, so that by an act of February 23, 1852, the separative system of government for the city was given up, the debts of the three municipalities were consolidated, and consolidation bonds were issued. This improved the financial conditions of the city and reestablished its credit. *New Orleans Price Current*, September 1, 1852.

be disposed of for cash. In 1854, accordingly, the legislature of Louisiana passed acts permitting New Orleans to subscribe directly to the stock of the roads by issuing twenty-year bonds bearing six per cent interest. These bonds were to be turned over to the railroads for equal amounts of stock and at the same rate the individual stockholders of the city were called on to pay up their shares. Under the operation of these acts the city itself, instead of the individual taxpayer, became a stockholder in the railroads.¹⁵

A new difficulty for the railroads, commerce, and banks now evolved. Other railroads came forward with requests for subscriptions from the city, and no one could tell where the subscribing movement might stop. This resulted in making it very hard for the railroads to find a market for the city bonds. The credit of the city was again being injured, and the bank notes based in part on these bonds could not be expected to have their rates of exchange continue favorable. The various interests agreed with the suggestion made by Mr. Forstall of the Opelousas railroad that the legislature prohibit any increase in the indebtedness of the municipality of New Orleans, and the legislature responded with an act to that effect.¹⁶

In this way the combination of interests with the coöperation of the state legislature brought about a safe and sane banking organization which redounded to the increase of credit facilities for commercial and internal improvements.

In 1854 the Louisiana legislature passed a resolution instructing the senators and requesting the representatives of the state

¹⁵ *Acts of Louisiana, 1854*, nos. 108, 109, 110, providing respectively for subscriptions to the New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western railroad, the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern railroad, and the Pontchartrain railroad.

¹⁶ Report of Forstall to the Board of directors, January 11, 1855, in *New Orleans Price Current*, February 17, 1855. See also Annual report of President Overton of the Opelousas railroad, January 17, 1855, *ibid.*, March 7, 1855. The law, approved March 15, 1855, is in *Acts of Louisiana, 1855*, 228 (no. 173). It reads in part:

"That it shall not hereafter be lawful for the Council of the City of New Orleans to authorize any increase of the amount of the present indebtedness of the said city."

Section 2: "That after the total indebtedness of said city shall have been reduced, under the operations of existing laws, to the amount of twelve millions of dollars, it shall not be lawful for the City Council to authorize any increase of said indebtedness beyond the sum herein specified, whether the said debt be in the form of bonds, loans, contracts, or engagements under any ordinance, resolution or other Act."

in congress to exert themselves to secure the passage of the pending bills for a grant of public lands from the general government to aid the Vicksburg, Shreveport and Texas railroad, the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern railroad, and the New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western railroad companies. On June 3, 1856, grants were made by congress for this purpose, and accepted by the state for the roads and set aside for their use by the legislature of 1857.¹⁷

The question of how to finance the building of railroads in part or entirely in the state of Louisiana had been answered in certain cases by the means herein stated, namely: by individual subscriptions; by aid from the municipalities in form of taxes or of bonds; by state bond issues; and by grants of lands from the general government.¹⁸

A number of railroad enterprises were begun in Louisiana during the fifties, some for developing transportation facilities for

¹⁷ *Acts of Louisiana, 1854*, 12 (no. 15); *Acts of Louisiana, 1857*, 76, 124 (nos. 98, 135).

¹⁸ The appended statements show the proportion of assistance from each source for the New Orleans, Jackson, and Great Northern railroad.

Statement of subscription to the capital stock of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern railroad company (1854)

(from *De Bow's review*, old series, 16: 651)

By whom payable	Amount
<i>Louisiana:</i>	
State of Louisiana	\$1,600,000.00
City of New Orleans	2,000,000.00
Taxpayers of New Orleans	333,333.33
Voluntary subscriptions in New Orleans	617,750.00
Contractors	186,720.00
<i>Mississippi:</i>	
State of Mississippi	600,000.00
Monroe county	460,000.00
Madison county	100,000.00
Attala county	72,075.00
Oktibbeha county	50,000.00
Hinds county	39,600.00
Copiah county	6,925.00
Pike county	9,500.00
Canton and Jackson railroad	44,170.00
Total	\$6,120,073.33

Memorial of the president of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great

the interior districts of the state, some for extending the area from which products might be secured from other states, and all for the better distribution of articles imported into New Orleans. The chief railroad undertaking related to trade between New Orleans and the upper Mississippi valley was the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern. The organization of a company for building this road was gradually brought about. Permission to organize was given it in Louisiana by 1852, and it was incorporated in the state by an act of the legislature in 1853. By an act of the same legislature the state agreed to subscribe for one-fifth of the capital stock of the company. The city of New Orleans subscribed to \$2,000,000 of stock, and private subscriptions made up the remainder of the capital for Louisiana investments in the company. The various counties of Mississippi through which the road was routed as well as the state of Mississippi were liberal subscribers. In fact, by far the largest part of the capital was subscribed by municipalities, counties, and states.¹⁹

The plan was to build from New Orleans to Jackson and there

Northern railroad company to the Mississippi legislature, showing amounts received from subscriptions, loans, and earnings, 1852-1860
(from *De Bow's review*, old series, vol. 28)

From State of Louisiana, for stock	\$ 884,000
From City of New Orleans, for stock	2,000,000
From citizens of Louisiana, for stock	939,092
<hr/>	
Total Louisiana subscription	\$3,823,092
From State of Mississippi, for stock	\$ 430,450
From citizens of Mississippi, for stock	269,962
<hr/>	
Total Mississippi subscription	\$ 700,412
Money borrowed on first mortgage bonds, due 1866	\$3,000,000
Money borrowed from Mississippi, payable 1864	185,000
Money borrowed from Mississippi, payable 1863	20,000
<hr/>	
Total borrowed	\$3,205,000
Railroad earnings, passage	\$ 709,130
Railroad earnings, freight	1,179,544
Railroad earnings, mails	55,000
<hr/>	
Total earnings	\$1,943,674

¹⁹ *Acts of Louisiana, 1853*, 109-115, 142-143. For the relative amounts of capital subscribed, see note 18.

connect with a road planned to be built north by which connections with the Tennessee and Ohio valleys would be made. There was much enthusiasm aroused for the establishment of the road, but all through the fifties the construction was halted by various causes, usually financial, and the road had been completed only to Canton, Mississippi, by 1860 — a distance of 206 miles from New Orleans. So far as actually handling western products is concerned, the road was not really operative before the civil war, though it developed considerable traffic in cotton by 1860.²⁰

The editor of the *New Orleans Price Current* never let slip an opportunity for urging energetic action in the building of railroads both to retain the cotton and other local business and to regain a larger proportion of the western trade. If the river stages were good, as in 1852, he pointed to the effect on the business interests of New Orleans and argued that the pros-

²⁰ *De Bow's review*, old series, 2: 519; *New Orleans Price Current*, June 26, 1852.

Altogether the state had issued bonds for subscription to the stocks of the following railroads during the fifties: New Orleans and Nashville; Mexican Gulf; New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern; New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western; Vicksburg, Shreveport and Texas; Baton-Rouge, Gross-Tete and Opelousas; and the estimated interest on these bonds for 1861 was \$159,300. *Acts of Louisiana, 1860, 189.*

The Louisiana mileage in operation had increased from 89 to 419 from 1850 to 1860. How little had actually been accomplished in railroad development in Louisiana during the decade is shown by the following table taken from *De Bow's review*, old series, 28:345 (March, 1860).

Railroads in Louisiana 1860	Length, In Opera-		Cost
	Miles	ation, Miles	
Baton Rouge, Gross-Tete & Opelousas	46	17	\$ 327,000
Clinton and Port Hudson*	22	22	750,666
Mexican Gulf*	27	27	622,911
Mecklinburgh and Lake Pontchartrain*	6	6	212,398
New Orleans and Carrollton*	6.5	6.5	500,000
Branch Tracks	3	3	
Jefferson and Lake Pontchartrain	4.5	4.5	
New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern	411	206	8,026,628
New Orleans, Opelousas and Great Western	258	80	4,043,631
Houston Branch	161	0	
Vicksburg, Shreveport and Texas	189	21	929,418
West Feliciana*	26	26	620,009
Total	1,160	419	\$16,073,270

* Built before 1850.

perity of 1852 would be the ordinary condition if only there were railroads to make the supply from the interior regular whether the water in the rivers was high or low. When the rivers were low, he insisted that the lesson should be learned, and railroads be pushed on rapidly. When business was good, he stated that with proper railroad connections New Orleans would take the place nature had destined for her; when business was bad, he pointed out the fact that lack of railroads was a leading cause. He regretted the slowness with which New Orleans had entered the railroad field, and the slow progress of the building, but commended where he could.

A second part of the policy for enlarging the business of New Orleans and making it a greater market for goods from the interior and for importations for up-river distribution was to develop the facilities for exportation, increase the shipping tonnage, and establish direct lines with European ports. It was stated in the trade reports in the early forties that a great deal of the western produce was merely transshipped at New Orleans and not really handled by the New Orleans market. The real markets in such cases were the competing Atlantic cities, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and others. The commission merchants and trading element of New Orleans were not favorable to such a process and hoped for the establishment of their city as a real market which could offer equal inducements with other competitors for this surplus by building up direct trade with Europe. There was a great deal of discussion on the advantages of such direct trade, and the necessity for local capital to own more shipping, but to the end of the fifties New Orleans continued to depend on northeastern and foreign owned ships for most of her carrying business. Consequently the vessels went where business was best, or where it was to the advantage of their owners to have them go. One result of this was that freight rates from New Orleans to England were regularly higher than those from New York during the fifties.²¹

The *New Orleans Price Current* made the following ingenious

²¹ This statement is based on a comparison of freight rates of the two places, as published in the *Shipping and Commercial List* and *New York Price Current*, *New Orleans Price Current*, and *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*.

argument in 1857 to interest the shipowners of the northeastern states in supporting Louisiana's railroad plans: "An efficient agent to this end (the progress of New Orleans) will be the speedy completion of the railroads now in progress and a still further extension of the system. Capital is wanted for these purposes, and we say to the northern navigation interest, as we have said on a former occasion, aid our railroads to develop our resources and you make freight for your ships. You have aided northern railroads to 'tap the West,' and have thus defeated your own interests."²²

The matter of steam communication between Boston and New Orleans was reported on favorably by a committee of the Boston board of trade in 1856. The chief argument was that the east and west routes were advantageous only when all lines of communication were open, and then the rush of traffic was such as to hinder the rapid and regular shipments. Consequently the products accumulated in the warehouses and came on with a rush for a while, then there would follow a period when none would be received. If only a regular and dependable line of steamers plying between Boston and New Orleans should be established, the river steamboats could "throughout the year afford a chance whereby the vast granaries of the West might be quietly and steadily drawn off and the accumulation, by which all the northern roads are choked up, prevented; giving us all through the winter, the flour and grain, now so impatiently waited for until spring; and taking in return the products of our industry equally wanted there in the winter." Such a line would make the trip from Boston to New Orleans in from eight to ten days, making it possible to land freight from Boston at St. Louis in about sixteen days. An act of incorporation for this enterprise was passed by the Massachusetts legislature of 1856.²³ In 1860 an appeal was made by the Boston board of trade to retired capitalists and owners of real estate for aid in establishing steam communication between Boston and New Orleans. For equipping two steamships \$400,000 was needed, one-fourth to be raised in New Orleans and cities on the Missis-

Boston
- New
Orleans
Link -
up

²² *New Orleans Price Current*, September 1, 1857.

²³ Pamphlet under cover "Boston business interests," in Harvard library, Econ. 7282.2.

issippi river, one-half of the remainder to be raised by capitalists and real estate owners of Boston, and the remainder by Boston merchants.²⁴ The *New Orleans Price Current* commented on the agitation for the establishment of lines of steam propellers between New Orleans and northern ports in 1858-1859, and noted that it was arousing considerable attention, and deserved to succeed since it would work to the advantage of all concerned, west, north, and south.²⁵

In addition to the proposals to develop better communications with Europe and the northern seaboard of the United States, New Orleans also planned to establish communication with California. In the early fifties the plan was to build a railroad across the isthmus. This took the form of the Tehuantepec route. New Orleans men gained control of the Tehuantepec railroad company, organized, and opened subscription books in 1850. Some progress was made in the affair, but the Mexican government placed difficulties in the way in 1851, and the work was checked. This was considered only a temporary hindrance and hope for the success of the work was kept alive for some time longer, but nothing practical came of the plans. By the middle of the decade this proposition gave way to plans for a southern railroad to the Pacific, and the Southern Pacific railroad company was created and incorporated in Louisiana in 1855. This plan for connecting New Orleans with California was discussed and agitated during the next few years.²⁶

By 1861 little actual progress had been made in enlarging the opportunities for New Orleans' trade with Europe or with California. There were periods when the exports of western products from New Orleans to Europe were temporarily increased, when, because of war or for some other unusual reason, European prices were high and the demand was heavy. But there was no real progressive increase in this particular export business. There was for the same period, however, an important increase in the export of cotton to Europe, especially to England.

As to the third part of the program mentioned in the early

²⁴ *Appeal to retired capitalists, ibid.*

²⁵ *New Orleans Price Current*, September 1, 1859.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, October 23, 26, ff., 1850; *De Bow's review*, old series, vols. 8, 9 (1850), vol. 11 (1851); *Acts of Louisiana, 1855*, 233-242.

part of this paper, the establishment of manufacturing in New Orleans, it may be said that although there was some development in that direction, yet it was far from satisfactory to those who had urged it. Capital evidently preferred other investments. After all, there was lack of sufficient active or available capital for all these undertakings. New Orleans had started too late and moved too slowly to meet the crisis in her trade with the old "west." The civil war completed the dam that the east and west railroads had begun, and the current of western products flowed east, not south.

ERASTUS PAUL PUCKETT

CENTRAL COLLEGE
FAYETTE, MISSOURI

PRESENT DAY TENDENCIES IN THE TEACHING OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

When Uncle Sam starts to take a census, he calls to his aid hundreds of supervisors and tens of thousands of enumerators. The person who attempts to tabulate the results of an investigation of the social studies in American high schools at the present time has attacked a task of almost similar magnitude, if he is fortunate enough to make the investigation at all. The problem is not a simple one, first, because of the difficulty in obtaining the facts, second, because of dissimilarities which are difficult to analyze, and third, because it is not easy to organize what facts one can get. The "fifty-seven varieties" which have made a certain manufacturer famous are not sufficient for the proper classification of the infinite variety of groups and combinations of high school courses in civics, history, and allied subjects. The most that can be done in a twenty minute paper is to present a few generalizations, state some of the more frequent requirements made by high schools, explain those combinations of studies which are commonest, and note a few of the newer tendencies.

To the majority of history teachers, the statements which have just been made would seem to apply to that period in the dark ages of secondary schools, before the Committee of ten and the Committee of seven issued their epoch-making reports. Some one exclaims, "How can there be such infinite variety, when, after all, the courses of history in the high schools are comparatively uniform at the present time!" That is exactly the trouble. The courses seem uniform, but they are a very long way from being so. The majority of them offer two years of European history, a year of American history and civics, together with citizenship at the beginning, or a half year of economics, or a year of economics and social problems at the end. Surely that is not a complicated arrangement. How, then, is it possible for courses which seem so much alike to be ex-

ceedingly diverse? The answer is twofold; the variety comes either in the differences within the courses themselves, or in the differences between the requirements made of students. It is not enough to know what schools *offer*, we must ask what is *required* of all students or of different students in the different courses. Of what value is it to have continuity in courses, if no one takes them, that is, takes three or four years of continuous, cumulative work? There is a large group among the fourteen thousand schools in the United States in which no student is compelled to take any history. There is a still larger number of schools which say they prescribe American history and civics; but, when we come to examine their courses of study, we find that American history and civics may be required in only one of ten or a dozen courses. If such a statement is not misleading, I do not know what it is. Since the education of the boy or the girl is a matter of continuous development for that student, what we should have is not so much uniformity in courses as unity and continuity in the training of youthful citizens.

REQUIREMENTS — GENERAL AND AMERICAN HISTORY

The first thing to be noticed is this: what social science is required and of whom is it demanded? We do not wish to make our courses rigid. On the other hand, we do not care to have a student select a half year or a year of one subject absolutely unrelated to anything else. Although we wish our courses in social science to be so interesting that all will wish to choose them, it must be made easy for students to take several successive years. Probably one-half of the high school students of the United States at the present time are following courses of study in schools which have groups of requirements for graduation. For convenience, we shall call these groups majors and minors. In most cases, the student selects one major subject for graduation, and in addition chooses one or two minors. The Chicago plan is typical of very many others: it suggests one major of three years, a first minor of two years, and a second minor of two years; but it does not insist that the minors shall necessarily have any logical or educational connection with the major. The

major and minor plan, however, gives teachers opportunity for continuous, thorough training of those students who select social science as either their major or one of their minors.

We of the west have always boasted of our progressiveness and of our interest in live, human subjects. We must look to our laurels. Since the great war more stress has been placed upon history and citizenship than in any preceding decade. I do not know whether the war was any more real in the east than it was in the west; I do know that the immigration problem is more pressing on the Atlantic coast than it is in the Mississippi valley or on the Pacific slope, and that the problem of Americanization, which is tied so closely with civics and citizenship, of necessity forges to the front in the northeastern states as it does not in other sections of this country. In any case, the largest eastern cities are taking the lead away from us by the requirements within their courses and by the stress which they are placing upon the social studies. Within the next year, New York city will go on a new basis of graduation from high school, requiring a year of American history and civics, a year of European history, and a half year of economics for every student who graduates from any high school in Greater New York in any course whatsoever. * The state of Pennsylvania has gone further. A recent bulletin of the special committee on social studies reports as follows: "While only three and one-half units of English and three and one-half units of history and the social studies are required, it is strongly recommended that, wherever possible, pupils shall cover the full four units in each of these lines." As the syllabus suggests that only "one year of mathematics and two of science should be included in every high school curriculum," and that "in addition, health instruction, including physical training at least two periods a week" should be all that is demanded in that important branch, teachers of social science cannot complain that our group of studies is being neglected.

I may be wrong, and I hope that I am wrong, in thinking that most cities of the Mississippi valley have not made progress equal to that indicated by these changes in eastern states. What business has the Atlantic border to set a pace for the active,

aggressive people of the west? The west produced the American race, the west has set very high standards of Americanization, the west has started practically all modern, progressive movements. Is the west to be beaten by the east in its own field of progressive, human high school work? In many eastern cities the schools follow the old college entrance requirements and are content to demand but one year of history — and ancient history at that. In the west, under the leadership of Professor Turner and other capable teachers, American history has been changed from a study of colonies, grown into a nation, to a study of the American people, developed largely in that magnificent domain, the Mississippi basin.

It is possible again that there is a difference between paper requirements and actual accomplishments. The statements made about New York and Pennsylvania deal with the future rather than with the present, and the information that I have from the north central states is chiefly old material. Yet see what a good showing it makes! In the Chicago high schools, a year of American history and a full year of civics are required of all high school pupils. Denver demands a year of American history and civics. Kansas City, Missouri, requires one year of history for graduation. In addition to other history requirements, Cleveland is proposing a course in "America's world relations" for freshmen. Cincinnati insists upon a year of American history and civics in half of her courses; I fear that the Cincinnati plan is more nearly typical of western high schools than are many of the others. Outside of the north central states, we have most of the students in Texas taking two years of European history and a year of American history and civics. California requires only four subjects of every graduate from the high schools of the state; but one of these is a year of history or other social science, usually American history and civics.

Recently the writer of this paper sent out a questionnaire, asking principals of schools throughout the country what they thought of the graduation requirements of the California plan of two years of English, one year of laboratory science, and one year of social science. Reports were received from only about one hundred and fifty cities, but the schools of these cities con-

tain probably more than one-half of the high school students in this country. In answer to the question, "What would you add to the California requirements?" a larger number favored an additional year of some kind of social science to an additional year of any other subject, although almost as many wanted three or four years of English instead of two. Two-thirds of the schools which favored an additional year of history are situated in the Mississippi valley, and all of the others, with a single exception, are on the Pacific coast. Three-fifths of those that favored two additional years of social science reported from the Mississippi valley. One southern school suggests that four years be required of all graduates. On the contrary, only one school from the Mississippi valley asked that a year of economics be made a school requirement, and a number on the Atlantic coast and in the Rocky Mountain region did make such a suggestion. A year of sociology or social problems was requested by ten schools, only two of which were located in the Mississippi valley. In most cases these reports were made by the principals, but in a few instances they were returned by teachers of social science. Certainly the west demands the best.

CITIZENSHIP COURSES FOR FRESHMEN

In a large number of high schools, courses in citizenship are offered to freshmen. In planning a course of study for the future, one must always take into account the fact that in a few years, in large cities, the junior high school will do the teaching for most of those who are now high school freshmen. At the present time, however, only three hundred and forty-nine out of fourteen thousand secondary schools are junior high schools. Almost without exception, the junior high schools from which reports have been presented offer some civics, and most of them require civics for one semester at least two periods a week, but usually every day.

The type of this work in citizenship or community civics must vary considerably, and it will vary considerably more within the next two or three years. A new textbook has just been published upon rural community civics; one is soon to be issued upon

community organization, life, and problems. A book on "every-day civics" is stressing the practical phases of community life; still another text devotes more than a quarter of its space to school citizenship. Books on industrial and vocational civics have been much in demand. This variety would indicate that schools are still in the experimental stage of this intensely interesting subject. Certainly it would be undesirable to attempt to get uniformity in courses when so many different types of work are being developed.

EUROPEAN HISTORY

A two year course in European history is offered in most schools. In New England, in some parts of the south, in a few Mississippi valley states, and in one state on the Pacific coast, this is the older course. As is well known, this course consists of ancient history to the time of Charlemagne, with a second year of medieval and modern history. In the middle Atlantic section, in the north central states, in the southwest, and on most of the Pacific coast, the newer course is used more commonly. So far as is known, no school has ever changed back from the new course to the old, but many are changing every year from the old to the new. In the newer course, the dividing point between the first and second year is to be found in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries; sometimes, as in the new course of New York state, it is as late as 1789. In spite of suggestions of several committees to the contrary, more students are now taking early European history than are studying modern European, partly because most schools have not organized regular four year courses in social science for the students. Mississippi valley schools and leaders were the first to put special stress upon the nineteenth century in Europe, just as they first stressed the period since the civil war in America. Although European history courses of the new type were worked out earliest by eastern high schools of commerce, largely under the leadership of Professor Robinson and his distinguished colleagues of Columbia university, modern European history is now taught more in the middle west than in any other part of the country.

THE FINAL YEAR

In many schools the last year of history is a course in American history and civics; but, as indicated above, many schools offer an additional year. Economics and practical sociology seem to be about equally popular in these courses. The economics is usually a modified course of the older college type; but the sociology is frequently a study of modern problems, social economics, and to some extent political science. A few attempts have been made to combine the more important elements of economics and political science and sociology. Professor Gettell has organized such a course for his freshmen at Amherst. For several years, the Pasadena high school has given a course in advanced civics under the title "Civic organization." The difficulty in organizing a satisfactory course of this kind is twofold. If it has unity, it is apt to be quite theoretical, because only through the study of underlying principles of economics, sociology, and government can a unified course be developed. If such a course is practical, it is apt to be a hodgepodge of materials that begin nowhere and end nowhere. The two courses that are mentioned are undoubtedly more theoretical than the average school desires to use.

PRACTICAL WORK AND SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Our schools ought to train every boy and girl not only as a future adult participant in government, but as a citizen of this great republic. What we need to give is preparation *in* citizenship rather than preparation *for* citizenship. Throughout the Mississippi valley, particular attention is given to debating, oratory, journalism, and other practical subjects. In many schools, courses are offered in these and in similar branches, such as dramatics and oral English. In a very much larger number, groups of students voluntarily organize clubs in order to carry on these activities. There are inter-class debates as well as debates between different schools, sometimes organized in leagues. Classes in dramatics frequently stage plays, and musical organizations give entertainments for the benefit of their fellow students. Throughout the entire west, attention is given to these interesting and practical activities which help

the students to find themselves, to learn public speaking, and to think on their feet.

Much training in citizenship can be given through student organizations and activities. Only about one-third of the larger schools of the United States have any real form of student self-government. The Mississippi valley schools are far ahead of those of the east in the encouragement which they give to students really to participate in the work that the school is doing, and yet the progress of student organization in the Mississippi valley schools is pitifully limited. The students do not take the part that they should in school assemblies. Less than one quarter of our schools encourage scholarship through honor societies. Those who know what wonderful work can be done through the organization of girls' leagues are surprised to find that only about thirty per cent of the schools have even attempted such organizations. Only one school in ten has organized a junior chamber of commerce to study business conditions within the community, and a still smaller number have civics clubs to make the community real to students of citizenship.

In response to a request for opinions on the success of student participation in school work and student activities, some of the replies were as follows: "success due to not over-elaborate machinery," "success must be attained slowly, only through education of student body," "better discipline, fewer cases handled by principal, marked improvement in every way," "crystallizes student opinion," "gives self-control, learn methods of proper conduct of meeting," "gives student body administration point of view," "creates greater sense of responsibility," "development of initiative and administrative responsibility," "development of ability, responsibility, interest, and appreciation on part of students."

CONCLUSION

To the ordinary observer, it seems a far cry from the chaos which existed in the social sciences before the days of the Committee of seven to the fairly uniform courses of the present time. But we have made mistakes. We have tried to standardize our

courses. Instead, we should have planned to *unify the work of the students.* In these days of general high schools, technical high schools, commercial high schools, and many others, it is impossible to prescribe a course which shall be uniform. The most that can be done is to ask for minimum requirements of all graduates of all schools. Probably some work in citizenship is of most importance, but, if possible, some history, European and American, should be taken by all students. For the pupils in some schools, in some courses, however, opportunity should be given to take a continuous and well organized four year course in the social sciences.

What, then, are the most pronounced tendencies in high school social science to-day? The first is toward more definite and more complete requirements. As shown above, this is particularly noticeable in the northeastern states. A second is toward stress upon citizenship, not only in courses in community civics and in civics of the ordinary type, but in the history that will help our young people to become better citizens. More American history is required than ever before, and civics is being taught where formerly the word was almost unknown. A third is toward the socialization of history. This is noticeable in the greater attention given to social life and changes, to economic causes and movements. It is shown in the rearrangement of values by dropping many subjects hoary with tradition and including many others that mark more closely the upward path of humanity. A fourth tendency puts stress upon modern times. If we are to study the past to understand the present, the most important movements must be those that are nearest us. A few years ago, less than a month was given to Europe in the last half century; to-day a semester of careful study is set aside for that period. Formerly the study of the colonies took a quarter of the time devoted to the United States; now that quarter is given to the years since the civil war. We are certainly getting a better historical perspective. A fifth tendency is to broaden the school life and educational interests of the boy and the girl, to interest them vitally in the school and to make their work outside of the class room a real part of their education. A sixth tendency is to develop something more

practical for the final year in social science. Hundreds of schools are working on a capstone course such as is desired by the new Committee of eight, the N. E. A. committee, and others. The aim of such a course is to round out and complete the earlier subjects; in many cases it brings together the material already treated, carries it farther than was possible in the earlier years, and organizes a unified but practical course in the elements of government, economics, and sociology. A seventh tendency, less noticeable than the others, is toward better methods. Normal schools and colleges are being asked to give us better preparation of teachers. The schools are insisting upon teachers prepared not alone in history, but in political science, in economics, and in sociology, as well as in psychology and in general education. An eighth tendency is to organize the work from the standpoint of the pupils rather than that of the courses. In the belief that continuous training is far more valuable than hit-or-miss work, courses are being organized to give cumulative results for the largest number of students and for the best students who can take a fair amount of social science or who can "major" in that branch.

A survey of the whole subject of school courses in social science and of work in citizenship, in class and out, shows these many hopeful tendencies. We are doing better work than in the past and are reaching more pupils. The survey shows, however, the need of earnest, concentrated effort not only to give more social science to a larger number of students, but to make our schools count for more in the present and future lives of our boys and girls.

ROSCOE LEWIS ASHLEY

PASADENA HIGH SCHOOL
CALIFORNIA

HISTORY IN THE STATE NORMAL SCHOOLS

I. INTRODUCTION

The great majority of the teachers in the public schools of the United States have been directly or indirectly dependent upon the state normal schools for their training. Tomorrow from these schools will come a large army of new recruits, and to these teacher-recruits will go for instruction the children from twenty million homes. It is obvious that whatever in any way affects the preparation of teachers in the normal schools in turn reacts directly upon the new citizenship of the entire country. To ask what is the character of the work, what are the tendencies in history instruction in the normal schools, is, therefore, to put no idle question. Preliminary to the consideration of that question, clarity and precision call for this explanatory word:

1. State normal schools are schools which devote themselves unreservedly to the preparation of teachers for the public schools, and which are maintained, controlled, and supervised by the authorities of the state in which they are located.

2. Of these schools there are three main types:

- (a) Those which admit students directly from the elementary school and from the earlier grades of high school, and which, therefore, feel compelled to offer two or three years of preparatory work of high school grade.

- (b) Those which admit as students only those who are high school graduates, and those of equivalent preparation, and which offer two years of work beyond high school in preparation of teachers for positions in the elementary schools.

- (c) Those which offer three or four years of work beyond high school in preparation of teachers for junior and senior high schools. Several of the schools of this type are now ranked as teachers' colleges and as such grant degrees.

3. Until very recently the state normal schools have been of doubtful status. Even yet, in many states their true place

and purpose are not clearly understood and defined. Many of them have been — in fact, many still are — little more than elementary training schools, devoting most of their energies to work of high school grade. Many of them have suffered from that form of educational ankylosis which some call “normal schoolitis.” Nearly all of them have suffered from a sentimental but determined opposition at the hands of universities and jealous colleges, and all of them have been either the victims or the beneficiaries of rapidly changing policies at the hands of state administrative authorities. Many of them are utter strangers to anything like far-visioned continuity of policy. All of them have suffered from niggardly, inadequate financial support, and are still suffering. Many of them now are in process of transition to teachers’ colleges, and within them there is almost constant shifting and rearrangement of courses. There appears to be plenty of movement, but because of unwise leadership and selfish opposition it has often been digressive and confusing rather than progressive and clarifying.

Some are inclined to charge the normal schools with mediocrity and tardiness in the work of educational improvement. Many believe that that is not true. Some of us have wondered if it is true of the history teachers in those schools. Are they lagging behind the procession in the improvement of their teaching methods and in the readjustment and improvement of their courses in this day of the “new history”? What are the praiseworthy features of the history work in those schools? Wherein is it weak or faulty? To what extent are teachers of history in the normal schools hampered in their work by inadequate equipment and other impediments?

With a sincere desire to get at the truth and to avoid inaccuracies of statement in considering these and other questions a questionnaire was sent out in February of the present year [1921] to 142 of the state normal schools in the United States, together with several personal letters on the subject of history teaching in the normal schools. In all, replies were received from 93 schools scattered over 40 states. In addition to the formal replies to the questionnaire the writer received many illuminating letters in which various phases of the subject under

investigation were treated in more satisfactory detail than was possible on the reply sheet which accompanied the questions sent out. The points covered by the questionnaire follow:

HISTORY IN THE NORMAL SCHOOLS

- I. *Required Courses*
 - a. Is history required in all courses?
 - b. How many semester hours of credit in history must a student earn before graduation from your school?
 - c. How many in American history? European history?
 - d. What courses in methods of teaching history do you offer?
- II. *Differentiation of Courses*

Is there any differentiation in history courses in your school for those who are preparing for different lines of work?
- III. *Faculty, Facilities, and Enrollment*
 - a. How many teachers in the history department?
 - b. Total enrollment of students in your school?
 - c. Total enrollment in history classes?
 - d. Approximately how many history reference volumes in your school library?
 - e. To what extent do your history students depend upon a single text book in the preparation of assignments?
- IV. *Periods and phases emphasized*
 - a. What periods of history are emphasized in your courses in
 1. European history?
 2. American history?
- V. *Revision of Courses*
 - a. How recently have your history courses been revised?
 - b. What has been the aim of such revision?
- VI. What publications, books, bulletins, monographs, has your department issued in the last five years?
- VII. What difference, if any, has the war made in the interest in history in your school?
- VIII. Add any other helpful information on the back of this sheet.

Signed.....

Position.....

II. THE HISTORY REQUIREMENT

Reports from the various schools indicate a wide variety of standards in both scope and content of courses and in the amount of history required. The great differences in requirement are due in a large measure to the fact that the schools reporting were of the various types indicated in the above introductory paragraphs. Those of the first type, in which a large amount of preparatory work is being done, show a large history requirement. The work in history in these schools is nearly all of high school grade. Of the schools of the other two types there are many which require no history whatever beyond the high school grade, while others require as much as 10 to 12 semester-hours.¹ In schools such as those of Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, and Wisconsin, which are giving courses for junior and senior high school teachers, the requirement in history is from 8 to 12 hours, with a total requirement in some schools of 16 to 25 hours for junior and senior high school teachers who are specializing in history. In schools giving four years of work beyond high school, that is, full-fledged teachers' colleges, the general requirement averages about 6 hours. The additional requirement for students specializing in history in these schools is about 16 to 18 semester hours. In Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Michigan, and Kansas, for instance, the history requirement for students majoring in history runs from 16 to 24 hours.

Because of the low teacher-training standards which still obtain in many states and because of the shortage of teachers, a large number of normal schools are giving many short courses merely to meet the certificate requirements of the elementary students who come to them. Such courses run from two to five semester hours and are frequently designated "review courses." If these courses are as thin as they are brief, the outlook for history instruction in the low-standard states is indeed discouraging.

In some few of the normal schools special departments are

¹ A semester-hour is the equivalent of one hour of class-work (with the necessary outside preparation) per week for one semester, or half year.

maintained for the preparation of teachers of special vocational lines, such as music, mechanic arts, domestic science, commercial work, and agriculture. Almost without exception no history is required in these courses.

In nearly all of the normal schools there is some opportunity for the student to elect history, but owing to the over-crowded programs of the instructors this elective opportunity is often very meager.

III. COURSES IN HISTORY METHODS

While there are many exceptions—too many by far if the normal schools are really to train teachers—there is a clearly defined tendency through courses in special methods in history to give the student pointed preparation in history teaching. Taking the replies to our recent questionnaire as a basis it seems safe to say that in a majority of the normal schools such special courses in methods and materials for the history teacher are required. Of the 93 schools replying, 22 schools—about 24 per cent—report no separate course in methods. Several of these explain, however, that the subject matter of the academic courses is oriented with the needs of the teacher in view.

In many schools instruction in methods and materials is left to the critic teacher in the training school division of the normal school to be given to the student only when he “takes practice teaching.” If he is not assigned to practice in history—and the opportunities in training schools for work with history classes are so limited that only a few student-teachers, or cadets, can be so assigned—he gets no training in history method whatever. Among the remaining 71 schools in which special methods courses are given there is no striking uniformity either in the dimensions of the courses or in aims and standards. The failure to establish in history “any body of theory and practice which approaches even desirable amounts of uniformity and stability” pointed out by Professor Inglis of Harvard in his recent book on the principles of secondary education,² is also manifest in the normal schools and colleges. In spite of the work of the last twenty-five years carried on by the committees

² Alexander James Inglis, *Principles of secondary education* (Boston, 1918).

of the American historical association and others, there are wide differences of opinion among the history teachers of this country as to what the scope and content of history courses in elementary and secondary schools should be. The reports of the Committee of seven, the Committee of eight, and the more recent committees of the American historical association, the Political science association, and the American sociological society, have had far-reaching influence not only among teachers of history in the normal schools but also among teachers in secondary and elementary schools. Even some state departments of education have been somewhat influenced by these reports, and this influence has been revealed in the courses of study in history prescribed by these departments for the schools under their jurisdiction. Consequently some evidence of uniformity is found in the history methods courses offered in the normal schools. Generally speaking these courses aim to do two things—first, to outline a desirable course in history for the various grades of schools for which the particular normal school prepares teachers, and, second, to train the student in the use of the best material and the most effective methods of history teaching. This uniformity is both intra-state and interstate. But my point is that there is all too little uniformity in such courses. Is there any good reason why the children of Massachusetts or Maryland, for instance, should be given a very different course in history from that which is given to children in Georgia or Wisconsin?

The situation is neither alarming nor hopeless, but it is doubtful that it will be much improved until able representatives from the elementary and secondary schools and from history faculties in normal schools and teachers' colleges are called into conference and committee, for the working out of nationwide standards as to what should be taught in history to all of America's children.

I do not mean to question the ability of the committees that thus far have worked on the problem. I mean only to suggest that the normal schools should be more adequately represented on such committees simply because they are closer to the elemen-

tary and secondary school problem than any other schools ever are.

IV. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF COURSES

Considering the limited, categorical information which this questionnaire brought, it is impossible to speak with authority on the subject of the content and scope of the history courses now in operation in the normal schools. However, the main features of these courses may be indicated with a fair degree of accuracy:

1. In the majority of schools reporting, American history is given marked preference over European history, both as a required subject and as an elective. Teachers report that since the great war a new interest in European history has been aroused, and that therefore they are offering more European history than formerly.

2. Several teachers report that since there is an increasing tendency to emphasize the so-called social sciences as a group, history is being forced to divide the field it has previously held with civics, Americanization, sociology, and other subjects that to some of our practical educational innovators seem to give greater promise of immediately functioning in the life of the student than history gives.

3. There is a clearly defined tendency to limit the courses in both European and American history to modern periods. This is true especially of those normal schools giving but two years of work beyond the high school. More specifically this means that in a large majority of these schools the work in European history is confined to the development of modern European nations since 1815 and to the European background of American history. In comparatively few schools is any stress placed upon the ancient and the early medieval periods. Critically considered this means that graduates of normal schools who teach in junior and senior high schools have scarcely any academic preparation in ancient and medieval history beyond that which they received in high school. In American history little colonial history is attempted. In nearly all schools the courses begin with the period of union (1760-1789), and in

many schools the tendency is to emphasize the development of the United States since the civil war.

4. In fully ten per cent of the schools it is evident that the history teachers are much inclined to embark upon the strong, modern cross-current of contemporary history. These teachers are letting no one guess about their position in this matter. Such statements as these are typical of this group:

"We are all the time hinging our work along the lines of what is being done, the affairs of to-day touching the past with its ups and downs in terms of the present with its ups and downs."

"Our attempt is to skeletonize the past. We are not given to much detail of the past as such."

"Our aim is to emphasize the recent years more, to stress Americanism and make the work more applicable to present conditions."

"We aim to emphasize present-day problems and conditions."

"Our aim is to get down to social studies more than the old line facts."

V. DEPARTMENTAL DIFFERENTIATION OF COURSES

Until very recently all normal school students were put through the same course of training regardless of whether they were preparing for primary work, grammar grade work, or work in a high school. To-day, however, there is a widespread movement to departmentalize the normal school courses. While the leaders in this movement are Wisconsin, New York, and Pennsylvania, other states are gradually swinging into line.

Of course this departmentalization of work in the normal schools has much to commend it. It means that students who go to these schools will be given pointed preparation for the particular line of teaching in which they desire to engage. There are serious dangers, however, not the least of which is the danger of assuming that normal schools should confine themselves to methodology and that every subject taught in a normal school must be professionalized. Our questionnaire furnishes abundant evidence of a general assumption that a primary teacher should not be required to take as much work in history

as teachers of grammar grades or junior high school grades. This assumption is open to serious criticism.

Putting academic considerations aside for the moment, and turning to the courses in history methods, there is a pressing need everywhere for distinct departmentalization. Yet in only a few schools in which methods courses are given is there any clearly defined differentiation in methods and materials for primary teachers, for instance, and methods and materials for teachers of other grades. However, it is indeed gratifying to find that in those few schools, as for instance some of the schools in Massachusetts, Idaho, New York, Michigan, Oregon, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, real progress is being made along the line of distinct departmental preparation for history teaching.

VI. RECENT RECONSTRUCTIVE EFFORT

The great war has brought a shifting in the point of view, a much greater interest in history, and a new emphasis upon world history and America's part in it. Be it said to the credit of the normal schools that many of them are in the van of the movement to reconstruct and rejuvenate the writing and teaching of history in this country. Referring again to our questionnaire, there is a nation-wide movement for revision of courses in these schools to throw more emphasis upon world history and upon social and economic phases of history rather than military and political phases. Such replies as these are typical:

Arkansas: "The interest here is shifted to the economic field."

Indiana: "We are trying to give more opportunity for modern and industrial history."

Iowa: "We are trying to give more opportunity to study Latin-American history and to emphasize the new movement to bring the course up-to-date and present the subject in the light of our war experiences."

Maryland: "We are trying to emphasize the factors that have served to bring about our evolution from European settlement to our present international situation."

Massachusetts: "Our desire is to find the collective judg-

ment of our history teachers as to what are the essential things that should be and can be taught in a two-year normal course."

New York: "Our aim has been to strengthen the academic side."

North Dakota: "We are aiming to meet the newer concept of history, stressing the work of the laborer, the inventor, the chemist, etc., with less attention to kings and warriors."

Pennsylvania: "We have aimed to make the work more professional."

From another Pennsylvania teacher comes this dissenting word: "The secret of this drastic departure in departmentalization and revision has not been fully revealed to me by the State Board."

South Dakota: "We aim to demand less ancient history."

Virginia: "Our aim in this revision has been to socialize the work more fully, if possible, and to conform more definitely to the general reshaping of educational plans and policies."

Idaho: "Our normal school prepares grade teachers largely, and the history received in the high school is not grade history; the same is true of civics and it does not follow that because one has high school history he can readily teach grade history. I think, therefore, that in planning our courses this should be kept in mind."

Furthermore, there are many normal school teachers who believe that either through ignorance, or through slavery to custom, or because of a desire to save time and space, many writers of history textbooks have failed to give the most important, most interesting, most virile conceptions emphatically to the student. These teachers are swinging more and more to what Mr. Barnes of Clark university calls "the new synthetic history." Some of the distinguishing features of the "new history," as the more forward-looking normal school teachers conceive it, are:

1. The military and political are strictly subordinated to the economic and broadly social aspects of the life of a people.
2. It is more interested in the thoughts and feelings of the masses than in the story of kings and princes and presidents merely.
3. It emphasizes richly detailed topical consideration as op-

posed to mere bare-bones chronology and outlines of facts, dates, and empty names. This indicates the seeking of historical truth from various sources, sidelights on situations, characters, regions, and events, and much explanatory, picture-making material.

4. It sends to the scrap heap textbooks which are written from the wrong point of view. Many of our Atlantic seaboard writers have failed to see that the true point of view in American history is not the growth of institutions on the Atlantic coast, but rather the westward movement and development, just as in English history the true point of view is not the life of a few millions of Europeans on a little island but rather the expansion of England to the ends of earth.

5. It does not ignore sectional development. It is national, but the national point of view is not permitted to obliterate the world view. The reciprocal influence of nations is revealed.

6. It stimulates and demands imagination, analysis, and careful reflection. It details rather than generalizes. It presents facts, and leaves the student free to draw his conclusions. It is not biased.

7. It sees that history is chiefly of value because of the light it throws upon the present. It is concerned with established truth. It believes that if we are to understand the present and appreciate the privileges of the present we must live again the struggles, the sorrows, the hardships, the dangers, the defeats, and the mistakes, the joys, the victories, and the works of achievement out of which the present has come. In order to relive history thus we must have brought before us vividly pictures of the people and the region in which they lived. These pictures must first of all be true pictures, and they must cover the wide range of activities in which the people engaged. They will tell us what men were doing for a living; what they ate; what they wrought with their hands and tools; how they dressed; how they fought enemies within and without the group; how they worked, played, worshiped, married, hewed, built, bought, sold, argued, traveled, and coöperated in satisfying common needs — in short, how they lived.

Reports and replies from some of the states, such as those from Idaho, Iowa, South Dakota, Virginia, California, and Mis-

souri, indicate that there are those who believe that history may be rejuvenated by shaping up and teaching definite courses in state and local history. They believe that through such history a paved path may be built into the larger past. This program has much to commend it, especially in the material which it furnishes for stories in elementary history. These materials lie near at hand and are therefore more understandable to the child than stories of life in other sections, especially if the geographic and economic conditions in those other sections differ widely from those found in the home region. But commendable and desirable though this may be, it should not be forgotten that there are pitfalls to be avoided in working up such a course. Not the least important is the danger that the student may fail to see that the state whose history he reads or hears is a political unit with artificial boundaries within which life developed not very differently—if differently in any important respects—from the life in other states in the same geographic region. Must we not see that state history, as such, has no place and should have no place separate and apart from sectional history, but that state and local history as a segment of sectional and national history has great place and function?

VII. SUMMARY AND CRITICISMS

1. There is a crying need for more academic history in nearly all of the normal schools, especially in those which are compelled to limit their courses to two years. To their sorrow these schools seem to be depending upon high schools for the academic work in history. There is a quite general and very erroneous assumption that a high school graduate, when he enters the normal school, has sufficient academic background in history to warrant the normal school in giving him only the technique of history teaching. For instance, in all of the schools in Pennsylvania and in some of the schools in New Mexico, Georgia, Nebraska, and Tennessee, there is no additional academic requirement except in a few courses. All of the work in history which is given the student preparing for elementary school positions is professionalized. Some of these states can certainly be commended for departmentalizing their courses, but their next move should be to follow the example set by New

York this year in requiring at least three years of training for teachers in both elementary and secondary schools. Wisconsin is now following hard upon New York in extending her courses for junior and senior high school teachers to three years. It is disappointing indeed to find that such a state as Pennsylvania in her zeal for departmentalization last year confined the students in her normal schools to courses in methodology with no academic background save that which they received in high school. On the other hand, while in many schools there is a praiseworthy effort to differentiate the work in professional courses in history in accordance with the teaching plans of the students in different departments, such differentiation is not so general as it should be. Among the states in which a very low academic requirement in history obtains are New Mexico, Georgia, Maryland, Idaho, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania. However, only in those states having full-fledged teachers' colleges giving four years of work is there anything like an adequate course of study for those who are preparing to teach.

2. Normal school teachers are overloaded. With teacher-to-student ratios running as high as our tabulated replies indicate — 4:659, 1:225, $1\frac{1}{2}$:250, 2:455 — it is not surprising that some of the weaknesses we have noted should appear. In the past five years a great majority of history teachers in the normal schools have, aside from class work, contributed but little, if anything, along the line of educational improvement. With a straight teaching program of twenty to twenty-five hours per week it is impossible for a teacher to write or send out anything in the form of monographs, bulletins, or syllabi for the use of the elementary and high school teachers. A second and fully as cogent a reason for the paucity of such material from the hands of normal school history departments is the lack of funds for the printing and dissemination of such bulletins.

3. With few exceptions the normal schools are suffering from inadequate financial support, and from misguidance and crippling manipulation at the hands of state authorities. From a southwestern school comes this indicative word:

"The condition of history teaching could not be worse than it is in this institution. Our appropriation is so limited that we don't have enough to hire a teacher of history, and the legis-

lature proposes to give us less. Then our course of study is determined by the legislature and not by the faculty of the normal school."

And this in enlightened America!

4. Normal school history libraries vary in size from 15 to more than 4,000 volumes. There appears to be no correlation between the size of the school and the number of volumes in the historical library. Indeed the school with the fewest students (Wyoming) has access to one of the largest libraries, while the school with the largest enrollment (Kansas) has a very meager history library.

5. There is too great dependence in many schools upon a single textbook in history. In about one-fifth of the schools history classes depend upon a single text almost entirely. In one-tenth, students are not at all tied down to one textbook, and in the remainder a single text is used "somewhat" to "very little." Let us hope that the day will soon come when students of high school and college caliber will no longer be sinned against by being bound to a single text either in European or American history. It is gratifying to find a majority of the teachers of history in the normal schools devoted to other methods than the textbook method.

6. There is too great an inclination since the great war to confine the emphasis to "contemporary history"—whatever that may be—and to load up our courses with so-called "social science," "Americanization," "community civics," and other subjects which are welcomed as a panacea for our national ills. It is well to call history to the bar and force it to "show cause" but to force it into a tertiary position is, in the humble judgment of the writer, unwise and indefensible in the light of a sound philosophy of social improvement.

In the consideration of "contemporary history" the question appears to be this: Do we want the whole truth about the past, or do we prefer that our children remain in ignorance of all save that which is dominated by present interests, viewed *not as it was*, but as *we think it must have been* judging from *what it appears to be to-day*? Many teachers evidently believe that there is not time enough to reveal much of the past, and that what is past is past and does not matter much. Might we not

just as reasonably assume that since hogs are barrel-shaped to-day they have always been barrel-shaped, and that therefore we need pay no attention to the razor-backed hog of pioneer days, or to why it was razor-backed, or how long it remained so? How hogs are bred to-day and put into the lard can and the sausage mill, and inspected and put on the table is "contemporary history," as some see it. It may be industrial geography, or civics, or descriptive economics, but it is certainly not history and cannot possibly perform the functions of history — one of the chief of which is to reveal faithfully the origins of the present.

7. The charge that the normal schools are making the mistake of overemphasizing methodology at the expense of academic foundation is undoubtedly true. Compelled to limit their courses to two years, as they are in a majority of the states, they are doubtless the victims of selfish circumstance more than of blind ignorance.

Just as long as the normal schools of this country are confined to two-year courses, and as long as they are dominated by short-visioned, political manipulators, just so long will such conditions as we have set forth exist. The time is more than ripe for a broadening and lengthening of the courses of training, not only for high school teachers, but for elementary teachers as well. Two years of training is certainly not enough, whether it be in history or in some other subject. How can Americans longer defend the cramping of those institutions which alone are consecrated to the task of preparing teachers for America's children! Until the governors and the legislatures of our states take more interest in the preparation of teachers than the average lay member of the church takes in the women's foreign missionary society there will be thousands of teachers sent out to the schools woefully lacking in preparation not only in history, but in other so-called "more practical" subjects.

8. There are, however, many hopeful indications of a nationwide improvement in normal school courses. The main features of this improvement are: the extension of courses to three, and in a few cases to four years, the reconstruction of history courses in the light of the "new history," a growing tendency to differentiate the work required of students preparing for different

lines of teaching, and a distinct movement to subordinate political and military history to economic, industrial, and broadly social phases of history.

WALTER B. DAVISON

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

THE AMERICAN BACKGROUND OF FEDERALISM

By Homer C. Hockett, *Ohio State University*

THE POLITICAL CAREER OF IGNATIUS DONNELLY

By John D. Hicks, *Hamline University*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review*, 8:80.]

THE CONTROL OF MANUFACTURING BY THE CONFEDERATE GOVERNMENT

By Charles W. Ramsdell, *University of Texas*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review*, 8:231.]

JOHN WESLEY, TORY

By William W. Sweet, *De Pauw University*

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
AND THEIR WORK IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

By Jenn Winslow Coltrane, *Washington, D. C.*

ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE NORTH MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
STATES IN RELATION TO THEIR HISTORY

By George R. Fox, *Three Oaks, Michigan*

THE HISTORICAL MUSEUM—ITS MAKING AND ITS
TEACHING VALUE

By Edward C. Page, *Northern Illinois State Normal School*

IN RE THAT AGGRESSIVE SLAVOCRACY

By Chauncey S. Boucher, *University of Texas*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review*, 8:13.]

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK'S SERVICE OF SUPPLY

By James G. Randall, *University of Illinois*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review*, 8:250.]

THE STATE OF DESERET

By Oscar A. Kinchin, *Butler College*

SOME FACTORS IN THE EXPANSION OF METHODISM
IN THE EARLY WEST

By W. M. Gewehr, *Morningside College*

THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PENSION
QUESTION, 1885-1897

By Donald L. McMurtry, *University of Iowa*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review*, 9:19.]

ADVERTISING PROPAGANDA OF EARLY IOWA

By Olynthus B. Clark, *Drake University*

THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THE INDIANS IN TEXAS

By Charles W. Ramsdell, *University of Texas*

THE RANCHMAN'S LAST FRONTIER

By E. E. Dale, *University of Oklahoma*

FIFTY-FIVE YEARS IN KANSAS

By J. F. Botkin, *Wichita, Kansas*

ON THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS TO STATEHOOD

By Ralph R. Price, *Kansas State Agricultural College*

PRESENT-DAY TENDENCIES IN THE TEACHING OF
SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

By J. R. H. Moore, *Emmerich High School, Indianapolis*

**STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL REVIEW**

Published quarterly at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Lincoln, Nebraska. This notice required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912.

Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Managing Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Business Manager, Clara S. Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Publisher, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Owner, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.

There are no bond holders, mortgagees, or other security holders.

CLARA S. PAINE, Secretary.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 9th day of May, 1922, by Clara S. Paine, Secretary.

MAX WESTERMAN, Notary Public.

(My commission expires August 3, 1927.)